The Trajectory of Archaic Greek Trimeters

BY

IPPOKRATIS KANTZIOS

BRILL MNEMOSYNE · SUPPLEMENTA

THE TRAJECTORY OF ARCHAIC GREEK TRIMETERS

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER • H. S. VERSNEL

I.J.F. DE JONG • P. H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, SPUISTRAAT 134, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM SEXAGESIMUM QUINTUM

IPPOKRATIS KANTZIOS

THE TRAJECTORY OF ARCHAIC GREEK TRIMETERS

THE TRAJECTORY OF ARCHAIC GREEK TRIMETERS

BY

IPPOKRATIS KANTZIOS

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2005

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Kantzios, Ippokratis.
The trajectory of archaic Greek trimeters / by Ippokratis Kantzios.
p. cm. – (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 265)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 90-04-14536-2 (alk. paper)
1. Greek language—Metrics and rhythmics. 2. Iambic trimeter. I. Title. II. Series.
PA188.I2 K36 2005

2005046993

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 14536 2

© Copyright 2005 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For Niki and Niko

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ix

Chapter One: Introduction 1
I. The Ancient Testimonies 2
II. The Ritual Model 12
III. The Secular or Sympotic Model 17
IV. Epic Elements 20
V. Direct References to a Sympotic Setting 22
VI. Settling on a Definition 28
VII. The Changing Face of Archaic Literary Iambus 29

Chapter Two: Thematic Elements of the Trimeters 34
I. Early Thematic Elements 35
A. Only in the First Generation 35
B. Only in the First Two Generations 38
II. Permanent Thematic Elements 39
A. In All Four Poets 39
B. In Three Poets 52
C. In Two Poets 62
III. General Observations 64
A. Themes Occurring Only in the First Generation 64
B. Themes Occurring Only in the First Two Generations 65
C. Permanent Thematic Conventions 66

Chapter Three: Morphology and Vocabulary of the Trimeters 75
I. Identity of Character 76
A. The Speaker (First Person) 76
B. The Addressee (Second Person) 82
C. Characters Other than Speaker and Addressee 85
II. The Use of Person 89
A. Archilochus and Hipponax 90
B. Semonides and Solon 92
III. The Use of Diction 94
A. Verbs 94
B. Nouns 95

Chapter Four: The Trimeters and Elegy 100
I. Thematic Elements 101
A. Elegy 101
B. Trimeters and Elegy: A Comparison 112
II. Identity of Character 117
A. Elegy 117
B. Trimeters and Elegy: A Comparison 124
III. The Use of Person 126
IV. The Use of Diction 128
A. Verbs 128
B. Nouns 130

Chapter Five: Inscriptions, Later Iambus and Tragedy 132
I. The Meter of Archaic Metric Inscriptions 133
A. Epitaphs 135
B. Dedications 137
C. Summary of Inscriptions 139
D. Observations 140
II. The Later Iambic Poets 142
A. The Poets 143
B. General Observations 147
III. Rise of Tragedy and Disappearance of Serious Iambus 151

Conclusion 163

Appendices
Appendix I 167
Appendix II 171
Appendix III 174
Appendix IV 179
Appendix V 185
Appendix VI 189

Works Cited 197

General Index 205

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work is an in-depth revision of the doctoral dissertation which I submitted to Bryn Mawr College in 1996. I would like to use this opportunity to thank again my teachers there, especially Richard Hamilton, who was my main advisor. In more direct relationship to this project, special thanks should go to William Murray, Director of the Interdisciplinary Center for Hellenic Studies at the University of South Florida, who set aside funds that facilitated the completion of this book and to my Chair, Victor Peppard, who granted me research leave in the spring of 2004. I would also like to thank a number of colleagues from different institutions for sending me books or articles I had difficulty obtaining: Crystyna Bartol, Diskin Clay, Nick Dobson, Andrew Ford, and Ralph Rosen. M. B. Wallace introduced me to Julia Lougovaya, whose advice and expertise saved me from many errors in the section on metrical inscriptions. She should not be held responsible for those that remain. Thanks also for assistance in various ways to the following students: Luca Lai, Bartholomäus Winkler, Lisa Raymond, Gregory Thole, and William Lehman. It would be an omission if I did not mention here the generosity of Peter Kourmolis, who through the American Foundation for Greek Language and Culture endowed the professorship I hold. I have left for last the person to whom I owe my deepest gratitude, Niki Holmes Kantzios, my partner in life and editor of this book. Her advice and criticism extended from stylistic matters to structure and coherence of argument. There should be no question that her assistance has improved the book greatly.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Early Greek poetry occurs in a variety of metrical forms, the most prominent being hexameter, elegy and iambus. Of these, iambus is the least understood, not only because its extant corpus is by far the smallest, but also because iambus even more than elegy has a wide range of subject matter that does not immediately seem to connect it consistently with a specific occasion or context of performance. In addition, the paucity of early references to iambus makes it difficult for us to discern how its nature and its function were understood in archaic Greece.[1]

However scholars have chosen to define iambus, it is agreed that its *floruit* was the archaic period (seventh-sixth centuries B.C.E.). Perhaps because of the short span of that period—little more than a hundred years—or perhaps because so much scholarly energy has been absorbed in defining the genre, scant attention has been expended on the matter of internal development of iambus. Its characteristics are generally discussed as unchanging over time. It is the contention of the author that this monolithic view is erroneous, that even within its short lifetime as an important literary genre definite patterns of change are recognizable, and that a reason for this trajectory may be posited. It may be that an acknowledgement of such a pattern of change will

[1] The limitations we moderns face seem also to have plagued the grammarians of late antiquity, if we are to judge from their attempts to explain the etymology of the term *ἴαμβος* primarily on the basis of onomatopoetic associations that bring forth the various aspects of the genre (content, meter, manner of performance). Gramm. Ambros. (p. 255 Nauck), for instance, derives the term from the verb *ἰάπτω* (to hurl) and the *Etymologicum Magnum*, from *ἰὸν βάζειν*, supplying the gloss *ὡς βέλη τὰ λεγόμενα*, obviously intending to underline the abusive nature of this kind of poetry; Diomedes (447.6) suggests *ἰέναι καὶ βοᾶν* and assumes that *ἴαμβος* derives from the hero Iambus, who, when about to throw his spear, would take a short and a long step, an echo of which are the short and long syllables of the iambic meter (*υ* -). Mar. Vict. I, VI 44, 28 K proposes the etymology of *ἰέναι βάδην*, which seems to refer to mode of performance (alluding to *κῶμος* or some other peripatetic activity).

even help to resolve some of the ambiguities in the ancient testimonia and permit a more secure definition of the genre.

But before we examine the development of iambus during the archaic period, it is necessary to define it at least provisionally. Are we dealing with a genre delimited purely by meter? Is it only the body of iambic verse that boasts a particular content? Or is there a further parameter related to aspects of performance? We will revisit first what the ancient authors, archaic and later, had to say on the subject, and then we will examine some modern attempts at defining iambus. Once we have settled on a definition (no small task), we will begin to observe the patterns in the genre across the seventh and sixth centuries, changes that affect not only content but diction and modes of presentation. Finally, we will propose some explanations for this wholesale shift.

I. The Ancient Testimonies

The earliest mention of iambus occurs in Archilochus, where the speaker claims in iambic meter

καί μ᾽ οὔτ᾽ ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει (fr. 215).[2]

Tzetzes, who quotes the line, informs us that the cause of the speaker's resignation from the pleasures of life is his deep mourning for the loss of his brother-in-law at sea. The connection of *τέρπομαι* and *τερπωλαί* with *θαλίαι* in two other fragments of Archilochus[3] leaves open the possibility that iambi here may denote songs performed at feasts. Indeed the majority of scholars are inclined to understand it so, with opinions varying only in the particulars. West suggests that "*ἴαμβοι* are not just verses but an occasion and that the poems of Archilochus which were known as iambi must have been so called because they were associated with such occasions."[4] Brown, in a similar vein, thinks that *ἴαμβοι* were songs performed at the occasions designated by *τερπωλαί*, which might have been "festivals

---

[2] Unless specified otherwise, text and fragment numbers reflect those of West 1998.

[3] *τερπωλὰς καὶ θαλίας ἐφέπων* (fr. 11); *οὔτέ τις ἀστῶν / μεμφόμενος θαλίῃς τέρψεται* (fr. 13).

[4] West 1974: 25.

at which various performers mentioned by Semus plied their trade."[5] Bartol,[6] in turn, understands *ἴαμβοι* as a special kind of *τερπωλή* that was fully available to the iambic poet only in the context of *θαλίαι* (religious ceremonies). It is tempting to take fr. 215 as denoting songs associated with festivities, perhaps even the lighter songs,[7] since these would have been the most likely to be in greatest discord with the speaker's current somber frame of mind. Yet the connection of iambi with a public occasion of entertainment is far from certain. That the setting need not be a public one is indicated by the fact that *τέρπομαι* and its derivatives *τέρψις* and *τερπωλή* (poetic for *τέρψις*, *LSJ*) are frequently associated with a private event, the symposium.[8] In fact, Bowie[9] takes a more agnostic view by suggesting that the disjunction *οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων* does not illuminate the context of performance because *οὔτ'...οὔτ'* can indicate either similar or dissimilar elements, so that it is impossible to tell whether *iamboi* is connected with *τερπωλέων* or is antithetical.

One piece of information that may help the discussion and that, curiously, has escaped notice, is the wording of the source in which the passage is quoted (Tzetz. *alleg. Hom. Ω* 125 ff.), wording that renders a restricted interpretation of the term *ἴαμβος* (light, joyful song, or song associated with festivities) rather unlikely. Instead it suggests that by "iambi" Archilochus means here poetry in general: (*Ἀρχίλοχος*) *περιπαθῶς ὠδύρετο, γράφειν μὴ θέλων ὅλως, λέγων πρὸς τοὺς βιάζοντας συγγράμμασιν ἐγκύπτειν "καί μ' οὔτ' ἰάμβων, κτλ.*" Tzetzes most probably derives his information from the poem itself or perhaps from ancient biographies, which, in any case, took most of

[5] Brown 1997: 49. Cf. Ath. 622b (Semus, *Περὶ παιάνων*, FGrH fr. 24): *οἱ αὐτοκάβδαλοι καλούμενοι ἐστεφανωμένοι κιττῷ σχέδην ἀπέφαινον ῥήσεις· ὕστερον δὲ ἴαμβοι ὠνομάσθησαν αὐτοί τε καὶ τὰ ποιήματα αὐτῶν.*

[6] Bartol 1993: 32.

[7] So Lasserre 1979: 59, who understands *ἴαμβοι* in fr. 215 as referring to entertaining poetry in general, not necessarily that which contains abuse and obscenity. Cf. also Degani 1993: 18.

[8] Theognis gives us several examples of such sympotic use: *τέρπομαι* 791, 975, 1042, 1047; *τερπωλή* appears in an unmistakable sympotic context in 1065-8 (*ἔστι δὲ κωμάζοντα μετ' αὐλητῆρος ἀείδειν...τερπωλὴ νικᾶι πάντα σὺν εὐφροσύνηι*). Rösler 1976: 302n.25 also thinks that Arch. 215 refers to a sympotic context. For the possibility of public feasts breaking up into smaller groups, and thus creating a symposium-like atmosphere, see Stehle 1997: 214 with reference to Schmitt-Pantel 1990: 14-33.

[9] Bowie 2001: 2-3.

their information from the poetry of their subjects.[10] It is very likely, then, that the poem from which fr. 215 derives went something like this: "Some people urge me to write songs but I am so devastated that I do not care for any songs at all nor for the pleasures of life."[11] It is of particular interest that Tzetzes uses the word *ὅλως*: the speaker ("Archilochus") is not depicted as unwilling to write a certain kind of song (for instance, humorous ones or those performed at feasts), but as unwilling to write any songs at all. Dover and Bowie seem to be overly cautious in their interpretation of this passage.[12] The speaker is in such mental disarray that, together with the other joys of life, he foregoes the pleasures of poetic creation altogether. *ἰάμβων* here seems to stand for "poetry in general," at least by way of metonymy if not by definition.

The term "iambus" appears nowhere else in archaic poetry. There is, however, an indirect reference in the Homeric Hymn to Demeter: while the goddess is distressed by the abduction of her daughter Persephone, Iambe, a servant, tries to cheer her up by joking and making gibes:

> *πολλὰ παρὰ σκώπτουσ' ἐτρέψατο πότνιαν ἁγνὴν*
> *μειδῆσαι γελάσαι τε καὶ ἵλαον σχεῖν θυμόν* (203-4).

[10] Cf. Lefkowitz 1976: 2 and 1981: xiii; Brown 1988: 478-81; Rosen 1988a: 174-9.

[11] Brown 1997: 49 makes a reference to the passage of Catullus 68, ll. 19-20, 25-6 (where the poet also mourns the death of his brother): "…a strikingly similar combination occurs: *studia* (poetic composition) is coupled with *omnes deliciae animi*, a phrase whose meaning seems to be very close to that of *τερπωλαί*." But even if *studia* does mean "poetic composition," the sense of *omnes deliciae animi* is far from associated exclusively with that of *τερπωλαί*. Cf. Fordyce 1961: 216-7: the word (*deliciae*) covers "a whole range of uninhibited behavior from wilfulness, egoism, airs, fads and affectations, to irresponsible pleasure-seeking, frivolity, dissipation, and sensuality" (with numerous examples).

[12] Dover 1963: 186: "Whether Archilochus meant by *ἴαμβοι* his poetry as a whole, irrespective of its metrical form, or one category of his poetry only, we do not know…" He proceeds with three possible different interpretations in note 2: *ἴαμβοι* as creative work, as expression of bitterness and enmity, and as (any other) enjoyment. A similar caution is offered by Bowie 2001: 2-3: "It is attractive to suppose that *iamboi* here is self-reflexive…that he is actually performing poetry which his words deny that he can compose. But…he could equally well be saying that his grief prevented him from being interested in either *iamboi* or jollifications and assume that the poem he was currently performing would be perceived as falling into neither category." It seems, however, that Tzetzes' remark limits the likelihood of some of the alternatives offered by the two scholars.

The strong etymological affinities between "Iambe" and "iambus" may explain why the former is considered the personification of the latter[13] and, in turn, why the subject matter of iambus is frequently associated with Iambe's *σκώμματα.* After all, the practice of *αἰσχρολογίαι* and *χλεῦαι* in certain religious festivals (Haloa, Stenia, Thesmophoria, and others) is thought by the ancients to have sprung from the legendary incident mentioned in the Hymn to Demeter.[14]

Our second earliest mention of iambus appears in Herodotus (1.12.2), who, probably referring to Arch. 19 (*οὔ μοι τὰ Γύγεω, κτλ.*), uses the term *ἐν ἰάμβῳ τριμέτρῳ.* We are not in a position to tell whether he indicates meter alone or both meter and content. One could argue for meter alone on account of the fact that three of the tetrameters of Archilochus (105, 131, 167) are introduced by the quoting sources as "tetrameters" (*ἐν τοῖς τετραμέτροις*), while three others (93, 111, 122) are identified as "iambus" (*ἐν ἰάμβῳ*). If tetrameters can also be described as "iambus," it is conceivable that Herodotus here uses *ἐν ἰάμβῳ τριμέτρῳ* to specify iambic trimeters as opposed to tetrameters, particularly since the term *τετράμετρον* is also used to indicate other metrical forms such as anapests.[15] On the other hand, since *ἐν τριμέτρῳ* could by itself indicate iambic trimeter, *ἰάμβῳ* may not be pleonastic and in fact may be a reference to the content. Scholars are generally prone to understand "iambic" here as meaning "abusive,"[16] but fr. 19 seems to have a contemplative character:

---

[13] For the derivation of *ἴαμβος* from Iambe, see Hsch. s.v. *ἴαμβοι* Schmidt: *ἰαμβίζειν· τὸ λοιδορεῖν, κακολογεῖν· ἀπὸ Ἰάμβης τῆς λοιδόρου.* Proclus *Chrest.* 29 (Severyns): *καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἰαμβίζειν κατά τινα γλῶσσαν λοιδορεῖν ἔλεγον. Οἱ δὲ ἀπό τινος Ἰάμβης θεραπαινίδος...* Among the supporters of the cultic nature of iambic poetry this etymological affinity produces the framework for their understanding of iambus' background and character.

[14] For lists of festivals in which abuse and obscenity occur, cf. Richardson 1974: 213 ff.; Henderson 1975:13 ff.; Rusten 1977: 157-61 on *aischrologia* in general; Rosen 1988b: 4 (with reference to Fluck). See also Bartol 1993: 36-7; Brown 1997: 16.

[15] Ar. *Nu.* 957 ff.; D. H. *Comp.* 25; see Bartol 1993: 88.n21. For the possibility of both trimeters and tetrameters being called iambus, see Dover 1963: 186; also Degani 1993: 17.

[16] So West 1974: 38: "When Herodotus says that Archilochus mentioned Gyges *ἐν ἰάμβῳ τριμέτρῳ* (1.12.2), he is surely not using *ἴαμβος* with reference to the rhythm but simply to the nature of the poem;" also Bartol 1993: 33. Brown 1997: 14: "Other authorities use *ἴαμβος* with less apparent precision. Aristotle, for example, uses *ἴαμβος* to refer both to fr. 19 and to fr. 122, which is in trochaic tetrameters. Such inconsistencies seem to indicate that the metrical reference is secondary, and that the primary significance of *ἴαμβος* lies elsewhere." But what if Aristotle does in fact

judging from the structure of *Anacreontea* 8, which is an imitation of it, we may project an outline of the poem according to which in the first part the speaker denounces what is objectionable to him while in the second he states what is desirable.[17] The facts that the speaker (Charon) deems wealth and power unworthy of his effort, and also that he is a carpenter, suggest that the point of his disquisition is the justification of his own quiet way of life, which is preferable to one prominent and privileged yet full of upheavals, intrigues, and risks.[18] Herodotus himself offers a similar didactic story elsewhere in which the obscure Tellus the Athenian is judged by Solon to be more blessed than Croesus (1.30). It is quite likely, then, that in fr. 19 the *psogos* mentioned by Aristotle[19] reflects merely a negative assessment of a notion that, although attractive to many, ought to be rejected, like the lifestyle of Gyges.[20] In short, the testimony of Herodotus is inconclusive, like the internal testimony of Archilochus himself.

After Herodotus, the sources tend to emphasize the abusive aspects of iambus.[21] Plato's most relevant reference appears in *Ion*, in a context that seems to imply invective (*ἐφ' ὃ ἡ Μοῦσα αὐτὸν ὥρμησεν, ὁ*

consider the tetrameters as *ἴαμβος* in a metrical sense, as the quoting sources of frr. 93 and 111 do? Note that in fr. 93 the subject is military, and fr. 111 is a prayer that echoes closely *Il.* 18.309. See below.

[17] This arrangement of thought can be observed in Arch. 114 as well, where two types of generals are juxtaposed; cf. also Sapph. 16 P: "Some say a host of horsemen is the most beautiful thing...but I say..."

[18] Lennartz 2000a: 1-9. Slings 1990: 19n.44 thinks that the fictional "I" of the poem has a particular function: although the poem does express the sentiments of the poet himself, he nevertheless prefers to put his words in the mouth of a fictional character when statements of value do not agree with those of the community. That the speaker here contradicts the *opinio communis* is indicated by fr. 23, according to which tyranny is coveted: *κείνης ἄνασσε καὶ τυραννίην ἔχε...ζηλωτὸς ἀνθρώπων ἔσεαι*, 20-1. To "hold tyranny" is used as parallel to *ἀνάσσειν*, cf. Parker 1998: 152; Yerly 1992: 6. Solon's assumption of the role of herald in the Salamis elegy may also indicate divergence from the opinion of the majority.

[19] See below.

[20] Nor should we see a mocking pun in the name of Charon, which brings to mind the famous ferryman of the Styx. "Charon" is not altogether unusual: in Euboea and the Aegean islands it appears eight times; in Cyrene, four; in Athens, five. Although there are many names which are encountered with much greater frequency, "Charon" is by no means one of the rarest, cf. Fraser and Matthews 1987.

[21] See the very useful list of testimonia assembled by Bartol 1993: 103-31, especially numbers 142-244.

μὲν διθυράμβους, ὁ δὲ ἐγκώμια, ὁ δὲ ὑπορχήματα, ὁ δ' ἔπη, ὁ δ' ἰάμβους, 534c).[22]

Aristotle and other later authors of antiquity seem at first glance to equate iambus with abuse as well.[23] The verb *ἰαμβίζειν* appears for the first time in Aristotle's statement *διὸ καὶ ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον ἀλλήλους* (*Poet.* 1448b32)[24] referring to the *εὐτελέστεροι,* who *ἐμιμοῦντο...τὰς τῶν φαύλων (πράξεις), πρῶτον ψόγους ποιοῦντες* (*Poet.* 1448b24-6). Aristotle thus makes a connection between the iambic meter and *ψόγοι,* in fact inferring that the iambic meter received its name from the type of content that appeared in it. A similar notion appears in his statement that (Crates) *πρῶτος ἦρξεν ἀφέμενος τῆς ἰαμβικῆς ἰδέας* (*Poet.* 1449b7), in the sense of giving up personal invective.

Elsewhere in Aristotle, however, the semantics may not be as clear. In referring to Homer as the author of *Margites* and as the first practitioner of *ψόγοι*, he explains that the subject matter is not abusive but *τὸ γελοῖον* (laughable), thus broadening the permissible content of invective. In *Rhet.* 1418b23 he refers to two poems by Archilochus, one in trimeters (fr. 19) and the other in tetrameters (fr. 122), and informs us that *Ἀρχίλοχος ψέγει.* Yet again the line Aristotle quotes in fr. 122, as well as the eight following lines recovered by Stobaeus, are not invective, at least in the conventional sense. "Had Aristotle wished to select from a poem whose purpose was *ψόγος*, a passage which actually *ψέγει*, he would surely have made a better choice than the verse *χρημάτων*... The father speaks about his own daughter, so we should not expect him to be very abusive."[25] The same innocuous kind of

[22] Cf. Murray 1996: 120, who thinks that the passage refers to the genre of iambic abuse rather than to the iambic dialogue and speeches of tragedy, which do not feature in *Ion*, especially in the light of the reference in 531a2. See also Brown 1997: 14.

[23] Apollod. 1.5.1; schol. Nic. *Alexiph.* 132; schol. *ad Heph.* 6; schol. *ad Pind. Pyth.* 2 (Drachmann), *et al.*, cf. Henderson 1975: 18n.58; Bartol 1993: 119-31.

[24] See Bowie's 2001: 26 observation about the importance of narrative in iambus. "This may have been apparent to Aristotle, who judged that the iambic poets engaged in *μίμησις* of *τὰς τῶν φαύλων πράξεις*. To him, then, there was a narrative element in *iamboi*."

[25] Dover 1963: 207. Of interest is the explanation of the scholiast at Arist. *Rhet.* 1418b28, according to which the father is advising an impoverished suitor to hope for money. Burnett 1983: 67 discredits this scenario on the basis that it is not abusive enough, "since it (i.e., abuse) ought to be as excessive as possible." Lasserre and Bonnard 1958: 27 on the other hand, take the fragment as a serious one: the father here is that of the poet himself, chastising his sister on account of her excessive grief for the death of her husband *Ἀρχηνακτίδης*.

ψόγος appears also in Arch. 19, in which Charon the carpenter speaks about values and priorities in life. Again, as in the case of fr. 122, the extant verses contain no abuse; on the contrary, they have a strong contemplative flavor on a par with the reflective poems of elegy. It seems, therefore that the *ψόγος* which Aristotle mentions here is not strictly abusive, an inference encouraged by the fact that the term encompasses a wide range of nuances, from an intensely hostile confrontation to a more benign and humorous critique and the depiction of mildly objectionable or even merely laughable matters.[26]

We must note in addition that, despite the frequency of associations of the term "iambus" with abuse after the fourth century, the iambic metrical corpus is not without unambiguous examples of serious trimeters and tetrameters (besides those in Arch. 93 and 111, mentioned above) of which the later authors are clearly aware, for example Sem. 1 (sober, pessimistic view of life); Sem. 6 (gnomic on women); and Solon 34 (*seisachtheia*).[27]

It is important to point out that although the term iambus may be used by scholars of late antiquity to refer to non-abusive poems in iambic meter, it is never applied to abusive poems in meter other than iambic. Invective appears in the poetries of Alcaeus, Sappho, and Anacreon in non-iambic metrical forms, a fact that later commentators notice.[28] Yet no one calls these poets iambographers, which suggests that meter does matter and content is not the determining factor.[29]

---

[26] Cf. Bowie 2001: 26: "It has been suggested to me that criticism was an indispensable part of iambos; given the fragmentary nature of our remains, it can be postulated that a poem from which a fragment lacking any traces of criticism did indeed have it in a lost section. But there is a sufficient number of passages where we at least can see no criticism to raise a question mark over that position." See also Gerber 1970: 57: Sem. 7 is at least half-serious. On non-abusive aspects of iambus, see Degani 1993: 17-9; Stehle 1997: 215n.11. For variations in the meaning of *σκώπτειν*, from "joke" and "jest" to "mock" and "deride," cf. Gentili 1988: 108; Halliwell 1991: 284.

[27] Cf. Diogenes Laertius' catalogue in which Solon's trimeters and tetrameters are called iambi; the testimony of Hieronymus which possibly reproduces a phrasing from the third century B.C.E. and which refers to the poems of Scythinus and some poems of Archilochus; the *Pinaces* of Callimachus, which enter all trimeters and tetrameters as *ἴαμβοι*, see West 1974: 38.

[28] See Degani 1993: 17; Aloni 2001: 29.

[29] Sappho's attack on Andromeda is described by Athenaeus with the verb *σκώπτω*, and by Maximus of Tyre with the term *κωμῳδέω*; Homeric words, like *ἀγέρωχος* (high-minded, lordly) are used by Alcaeus (as well as Archilochus and the comic poets) with the meaning of *ἄκοσμος, ἀλαζών* (arrogant), cf. Andrisano 2001: 42n.5.

West[30] suggests that ἴαμβος does not automatically imply a particular metrical type and that iambic meter got its name from being particularly characteristic of ἴαμβοι, not vice versa. But, as Lennartz[31] points out in an important article, a general expansion of the term ἴαμβος and ἰαμβεῖον to hexameters, elegy, or lyric never took place: from the earliest time, iambus is strictly connected with the iambic trimeter and trochaic tetrameter, with the addition of the epodes and asynarteta at a later point.

Such considerations, however, did not sway the critics of later antiquity from the invective connotation of iambic poetry. Despite the fact that Archilochus, for instance, was considered a σοφός (*Rhet.* 1398b11) and a man divinely supported in his vocation and even honored with his own altar,[32] more frequently than not he was associated with the poetry of abuse. But, as we will see later, down to the time of Hipponax the thematic scope of iambus is quite diverse and includes poems that range from the chronicling of daily activity to military, political and philosophical subjects. In a sense, early iambus presents us with a situation comparable to that of elegy: later sources tell us that the origins of elegy lie in θρῆνος but we are unable to substantiate this fact from the extant fragments.[33] Regarding iambus the sources speak chiefly of abuse, but the extant fragments suggest that a large part of early iambic poetry is not abusive. This incomplete depiction of iambus may be explained in two ways: first, from the middle of the sixth century onwards—that is, from its later manifestations—iambus does focus very narrowly on abusive and invective themes, and this fact may have influenced subsequent authors to perceive iambus as primarily abusive from its beginning. Second, Aristotle and the other

---

[30] West 1974: 22; Brown 1997: 14. Contrast Bowie 2001: 5. See also Lennartz 2000b: 229: The songs of phallophoroi and the term "rheseis" show us that these poems are in iambic meter. This is reason enough for later commentators to call these poems and their actors ἴαμβοι.

[31] Lennartz 2000b: 225- 50.

[32] See Burnett 1983: 19; also, Nagy 1979: 301. The whole idea of a liminal trickster, as envisioned by Miralles and Portulas 1983: 11-60, who lives outside the organized society and challenges its values, does not seem to be valid. This is different from what might be called "metanastic poetics," the discourse of the dislocated native (Archilochus and Semonides are known as colonizers) who functions in the geographical periphery but nevertheless retains his elite status. Cf. also Ford 1993: 59-73.

[33] Harvey 1955: 170-1; Bowie 1986: 22-5. But see Page 1936: 206-30 and Gentili 1988: 32, 244n.3.

later authors may not intend to convey an objective and complete assessment of iambus but rather to underline its most noticeable aspect. The references to iambus, then, may be compared with those to the character and lives of archaic poets, which show us how posterity is able to distort a poet's image.[34] Let us imagine for a moment that no actual verse of Archilochus has survived and we have to rely exclusively on literary sources for our information about his poetry. Pindar calls him *ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν πιαινόμενον* (*Pyth.* 2.54-5); Critias blames (*αἰτιᾶται*) him because he himself caused his bad reputation by admitting that he was the son of a slave, adulterer man of lust, thrower away of his shield, etc. (fr. 295); Gorgias calls sarcastic Plato *νέος Ἀρχίλοχος* (Ath. 505d); Aristotle, quoting Alcidamas, describes Archilochus as *βλάσφημος* (in the sense of abusive, *Rhet.* 1398b11); and so on. Although these characterizations reflect accurately certain aspects of Archilochus' poetry, they nevertheless offer only a partial view, for as in fact we know, the poet's iambic repertory is quite wide and diverse: next to his *ψόγοι* we find anxiety for the return of a beloved one from a sea-trip (fr. 24); next to his obscenities, sober contemplation on the brutal realities of warfare and on important issues such as power, wealth (fr. 19), human vulnerability (fr. 131) and the elusiveness of real success (fr. 133). It seems that from the fourth century on, references to early iambus, perhaps reflecting current practice, tend to emphasize one of its aspects at the expense of the others. We should reiterate, however, that a large part of the iambics of Archilochus and Semonides (not to mention Solon) does not fit this profile. On the other hand, lyric poetry, too, can be aggressive, for example, Anacreon's treatment of Artemon (388 P) or the attacks of Alcaeus on Pittacus in poems known as *στασιωτικά*.[35] Blame poetry belongs to many different literary genres, being flexible enough to adjust to particular poetic conventions while still being able to maintain its identity. But does such an identity constitute a genre in itself? If invective content alone does not separate the iambus from other genres, we must look for additional parameters. The stereotypes imposed on early iambus by the tradition of later antiquity have served us questionably and need to be reexamined.

---

[34] On the emphasis on the sensational and negative, see Lefkowitz 1981: 25.

[35] The conventional themes of invective targeting social background, physical appearance, drunkenness, gluttony, and so on, can already be recognized in Alcaeus, cf. Davies 1985: 32.

A major difficulty for any modern study of archaic poetic genres, of course, lies in the fact that genre was not defined or even conceptualized until the Alexandrian period, with the result that the (problematic) application of later criteria to a much earlier body of literature becomes a temptation.[36] Callimachus and his contemporaries classify poetry using a variety of criteria: the poems of Sappho are arranged, to a considerable extent, according to their meter; those of Pindar, Bacchylides and Simonides are grouped under the titles of hymn, epinicion, paean and so on, according to their *εἴδη*, that is, according to the circumstances associated with the purpose of their performance, which determines their function.[37] The identities of the speaker and the addressee are another criterion for classification: dithyrambs, for instance, are addressed to Dionysus, paeans to Apollo, and so forth. The compilation of the canon of the nine lyric poets is made on the basis of the mode of performance or use of musical instrument. Proclus classifies poetry into *τὰ εἰς θεούς* and *τὰ εἰς ἀνθρώπους*, with a *γένος μικτόν* to accommodate the doubtful cases of *παρθένια* and *δαφνηφορικά*.[38]

The variety of ways in which the ancients partition poetry provides good evidence for lack of a widely accepted system of classification.[39] Clearly the literati of later antiquity do not provide us with the definition of iambus that we need, and we must pose again in modern times the questions we raised above: Is iambus to be defined by meter? By content? Or by the setting in which it is performed? Modern scholars are divided, first of all, on the context of iambic performance, an issue that impacts seriously the role of content in any definition of the genre.

---

[36] See Rossi's 1971: 77 aphorism: for the archaic period: "*leggi non scritte, ma rispettate*;" after the fifth century: "*leggi scritte e rispettate*." Also Calame 1977: 149-76; Dougherty 1994: 43n.44.

[37] Harvey 1955: 159-60; Depew 1992: 315-6; Bartol 1992: 65.

[38] There may even be division according to strophic structure: *τῶν ᾠδῶν αἱ μὲν εἰσιν μονόστροφοι, αἱ δὲ τριαδικαί*, cf. Harvey 1955: 159. Before the Alexandrians, Plato (*Leg*. 700a-b) recognized as criteria form and content, dividing the genres (*εἴδη/σχήματα*) into hymn, threnos, paean, dithyramb and nome. Harvey for the most part follows this division.

[39] See, for instance, Ps. Plutarch (*De Mus*. 9), who wonders whether are there any differences between a paean and a hyporchema; cf. Calame 1974: 116.

II. The Ritual Model

Its apparent association with the mockeries of Iambe and the ritual abuse at festivals, the (ambiguous) connection of iambus with invective by Aristotle and a number of later authors, and finally certain assumptions about the criteria used by the ancients for the classification of poetry have led many scholars to consider iambus as an exclusively humorous, irreverent, invective and obscene kind of poetry connected with the worship of Demeter and Dionysus. Such an understanding of iambus has important ramifications, not only because it denies the iambic character to a large portion of poetry in iambic meter (much of Archilochus and Semonides and virtually all of Solon)[40] but also because it raises important issues about the context of iambic performance.

According to the ritual/abusive paradigm, the iambic poet functions within the context of a religious festival—that is, a communal occasion—thus concerning himself with social and moral issues that affect the standing of the community as a whole. But his is not a serious discussion of morality. His role is to protect the public by exposing and attacking scurrilously those human traits that may become a threat to the welfare of the society.[41] Therefore his poetry is invective, and his invective is not only approved by the gods in a general way but even sanctioned by them intimately through the special circumstances under which he attains his vocation.[42] Both Archilochus' and Hipponax's poetic careers are connected with initiation scenes that

[40] See, for instance, Gerber's recent edition of Greek iambic poetry (1999), which does not include Solon, although it does include the "serious" iambic poems of Archilochus and Semonides. This approach is hardly new, since already from antiquity the canon of the iambic poets includes primarily Archilochus, Semonides and Hipponax, cf. Luc., *Pseudol.* 2 Maceod; Procl. Ap. Phot. *bibl.* (v.158.27 Henry).

[41] Cf. Koster 1980: 39 on the importance of the the poet in the protection of social values and norms; also Acosta-Hughes 2002: 2, 218-20, who comments on ethical criticism in archaic iambus and recognizes that amidst the coarse, vulgar, and graphically explicit sexual language there is also moral commentary usually found in more elevated poetic forms.

[42] On the social function of iambus and its consonance with that of the larger religious context, see Brown 1997: 42. Müller 1985: 107 notes how appropriate Archilochus' abuse of the Muses is for the initiation of the poet of invective *par excellence*. That the Muses respond to his abuse accordingly and with a playful attitude is a good indication that his practice of invective is favorable to the gods. For the interaction between the poet and the Muses in the initiation scene of Archilochus, see also West 1964: 142 and Tucker 1987: 82.

point out their role as divinely appointed protectors of their societies: the former is inducted into the world of poetry by none other than the Muses themselves, who, in the shape of women, take away his cow and leave him with a lyre, symbol and authorization of his craft,[43] in an encounter whose general outline is not much different from that of Hesiod with the Muses.[44] Hipponax becomes a poet through the agency of Iambe, whom he meets at the seaside while she is washing wool.[45]

It is crucial to their argument that adherents of the ritual model establish cult space as the setting of iambic (invective) performance in the archaic period. It is not unreasonable to accept that Archilochus was performed at festivals alongside Homer, if we are to read such a message from Heraclitus' derogatory remark *τόν τε Ὅμηρον ἔφασκεν ἄξιον ἐκ τῶν ἀγώνων ἐκβάλλεσθαι καὶ ῥαπίζεσθαι καὶ Ἀρχίλοχον ὁμοίως*, Heracl. fr. 30 Marcovich = 21 B 42 DK. Aristotle also informs us of public performances of iambic poetry.[46] Yet the presence of archaic iambus in the ritual space is far from self-evident: in the first place, Aristotle is speaking of the iambus of his own time, the fourth century. Furthermore, it is a great leap between the information provided by Heraclitus' comment and the assumption that iambic poetry in its invective aspect was performed at festivals.[47] Archilochus wrote on a variety of subjects, among them the mythological, which might render other parts of his poetry than the invective suitable for

---

[43] The whole incident is described in the Mnesiepes inscription (Col. E1 II 22-40), which probably was part of the Archilocheion the Parians erected in honor of the poet. For the reconstruction of the inscription, see Müller 1985: 99-151.

[44] Although, as Tucker 1987: 79 points out, it is significant that Archilochus and the Muses exchange abuse with each other, while in Hesiod's case, he is in a passive position, acting only as a recipient.

[45] Choerob. *ad Hephaest.* 3.1 (p. 214.8-20 Consbruch): *ᾗ Ἱππῶναξ ὁ ἰαμβοποιὸς παρὰ θάλασσαν ἔρια πλυνούσῃ συντυχὼν ἤκουσε τῆς σκάφης ἐφαψάμενος, ἐφ' ἧς ἔπλυνεν ἡ γραῦς, ἄνθρωπ', ἄπελθε, τὴν σκάφην ἀνατρέπεις. καὶ συλλαβὼν τὸ ῥηθὲν οὕτως ὠνόμασε τὸ μέτρον.* Cf. Rosen 1988a: 174-9. Brown 1988: 478-81 and 1997: 83-4 remarks, regarding the distinct nature of the initiation scenes in Archilochus and Hipponax, that the former achieves a high stylistic level, occasionally perceived as on being a par with that of Homer; the latter, through his initiation by Iambe, rejects the lofty associations of Archilochus and becomes the voice of the disreputable back alleys and demi-monde.

[46] *τοὺς δὲ νεωτέρους οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε κωμῳδίας θεατὰς νομοθετητέον, πρὶν ἢ τὴν ἡλικίαν λάβωσι ἐν ᾗ καὶ κατακλίσεως ὑπάρξει κοινωνεῖν ἤδη καὶ μέθης*, Arist. *Pol.* 1336b20. On the evidence of performance of iambic poetry in the fourth century, see Bartol 1992: 65-71.

[47] Cf. Brown 1997: 13.

performance alongside the Homeric poems. Notopoulos[48] in fact attempts to show that the evidence from the testimonia suggests that Archilochus wrote epic poetry: Dio Chrysostom (*Or*. 60), the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (1.1212) and the scholiast on the *Iliad* (21.237) tell of a poem of Archilochus about Heracles, Nessus and Deianeira.[49] In actuality it is difficult to say in which meter the mythological narratives were composed. Even if they appeared in iambic meter, which is possible, there is no reason to believe that they bore any resemblance to the scurrilous songs associated with cult or that they were anything but serious. Dio Chrys. 60.1 in fact discusses Archilochus in connection with Sophocles (fr. 215).

There are also additional allusions within the poetry of Archilochus that are often taken as evidence of cult performance. In frr. 120 (*καλὸν ἐξάρξαι / μέλος οἶδα διθύραμβον*) and 121 (*αὐτὸς ἐξάρχων πρὸς αὐλὸν παιήονα*) the speaker describes himself as *ἐξάρχων*, a technical term (conducting professionally, performing in some official capacity) that is used of the leaders of choral songs in religious contexts. Aristotle refers to *ἐξάρχοντες* of the dithyramb to whose activity he attributes the origins of tragedy (*Poet*. 1449a11), and sympathizers with the ritual model have imagined Archilochus leading the song in some Dionysiac festival or *κῶμος*.[50] The connection of Archilochus with Dionysus may also be suggested by the Mnesiepes inscription, which mentions the name of the god in the beginning of one of his verses and "appears to have told how Archilochus attempted to 'teach his fellow-citizens' a new kind of Dionysus phallus-worship."[51] But the association of Archilochus with cult may be more tenuous, as Athenaeus' reference (628a) to Philochorus suggests,[52] a reference which prompts

---

[48] Notopoulos 1966: 311-5. So also Bartol 1992: 65n.3.

[49] Notopoulos' view that mythological subjects are epic material and could not have come from Archilochus' lyric poetry, which is personal and non-epic, creates an unnecessary and probably invalid distinction, since it has become increasingly clear that his poetry cannot necessarily be taken as autobiographical and historical. Will 1966: 65, in the same direction, thinks that Heraclitus is impatient with Archilochus (as with Homer) because his mythological narratives go against *logos*.

[50] Cf. Brown 1997: 26.

[51] Podlecki 1984: 40. According to Podlecki, Archilochus associates himself with both the dithyramb and the paean; so also Brown 1997: 47. On the Dionysiac poetry of Archilochus introduced to Paros, to which the Mnesiepes inscription refers, see Clay 2001: 97-112.

[52] *...ἀλλ' ὅταν σπένδωσι* (i.e., *οἱ παλαιοί*), *τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον ἐν οἴνῳ καὶ μέθῃ, τὸν δ' Ἀπόλλωνα μεθ' ἡσυχίας καὶ τάξεως μέλποντες.*

Käppel[53] to classify fr. 121 in the section "*Der Paian beim Symposion.*" All said, even if there is validity in the assumption that Archilochus composed dithyrambs and paeans, this in itself constitutes no evidence that the function and context of his iambic poetry are similar to those of the dithyrambs and the paeans, which are distinctly different genres.

The most influential supporter of the narrowly scurrilous character of iambus has been M. L. West, who divides poems in iambic meter into iambi "in the true and original [i.e., cultic] sense" and "other verse in similar metres."[54] True iambi, according to him, may be recognized "in those types of subject matter for which elegiacs are never used: that is, in explicitly sexual poems, in invective which goes beyond the witty banter we found in elegy, and in certain other sorts of vulgarity."[55] The other, non-true iambus appears in trochaic tetrameters and iambic trimeters and seems "to have been used as freely as the elegiacs for everyday purposes, in circumstances where it is impossible to see why the special name iambus should have been conferred on them."[56]

West's division is based on the notion that literary iambus is directly connected with the worship of Demeter and Dionysus. The large portions of metrically iambic poetry which contain no obscenity or abuse cannot be truly iambic because they do not fit the profile of verse performed in a religious context, the prototype of which is the mockeries of Iambe. West argues for the connection between literary iambus and cult through Archilochus' family association with the

[53] Käppel 1992: 317. For paeans at the symposia cf. Alcman fr. 98.2, Pl. *Symp.* 176a.

[54] West 1974: 25. See also the extensive treatment by Brown 1997: 13-88 in the same direction, although he sees the extant archaic iambic poetry as the crystallization of cult-song. "A literary evolution of this sort was possible in any community that held a festival at which song played an important role," 36-7. One is, in fact, tempted to argue the other way around: a drastic evolution of this sort is more likely to take place when the context and occasion of performance change. Burnett 1983: 57 also seems to acknowledge some of the cultic characteristics in the abusive poems, especially their aspects of magic, thought to be able to heal and purify. For the association of poetry of love and vituperation with magic and ritual, see also Van Sickle 1975: 123-55.

[55] West 1974: 25.

[56] *Ibid.*

worship of Demeter;[57] the element -amb- in the name of the perennially abused Lycambes, which is related to the -amb- of iambus, dithyrambus, thriambus, ithymbus, all of them associated with Dionysus and Demeter; the similarity of the Lycambes family story to one existing in Naxos, suggesting that Lycambes and his daughters are stock characters in a traditional entertainment with a ritual basis, not living contemporaries of Archilochus;[58] and finally, Lycambes' patronymic *Δωτάδης*, which is associated with Demeter's assumed names *Δώς* and *Δω-μάτηρ*. West's model has received widespread acceptance, albeit in various adaptations.[59]

Although no surviving ancient testimony describes directly the circumstances of performance of literary iambus in the archaic period,[60] West, through inference from later sources, suggests that literary iambus is very similar to comedy in the sense that it is performed by choruses primarily of satyrs or animals, and while frequently narratives are reported by a narrator, on occasion the dialogues are acted out by actors.[61] Similarly inclined is Lasserre, who also believes that iambic

[57] Paros is one of the major cult centers of Demeter. Archilochus' family is credited with the introduction of the rites of the goddess to Thasos, West 1974: 24; also Brown 1997: 47.

[58] West's adoption of stock characters breaks decisively away from the established biographical approach; see also Dover 1963: 183-212, who was the first to question the historical validity of the poet's self-references. For a review of the Lycambes biographical/fictional status see Bossi 1981: 117-42. For the tendency of American scholarship, as opposed to German, to reject the biographical elements, see Rösler 1985: 137-140.

[59] Cf., for instance, Nagy 1976: 191-205, who, although he accepts the typological premise, envisions an intimate setting of performance: the audience of Archilochus is his *φίλοι*, and the invective toward them would have not gone far enough to jeopardize the *φιλότης*; see also Brown 1997: 43-69, who reverses Nagy's pattern by suggesting that Lycambes is a real person, although Archilochus does not treat his quarrel with him as a purely personal matter, but in a way which conforms to the conventions of cultic iambus, the purpose of which is to protect and reinforce the values of society.

[60] Cf. Bartol 1992: 65.

[61] West 1974: 36: "If one may suppose that the *ἴαμβοι* and *τερπωλαί* which he (i.e., Archilochus) mentions included dancing by these or some other ludicrous troupe, as well as presentation of entertaining monologues, such as he composed, it would be easy for the name iambus to attach itself to the latter in particular." For the view that the background and nature of festivity with which iambus is associated may link it up with the Near East, see West 1997: 495. For the similarities between the performer of iambic poetry and similar figures such as the *δεικηλιστής* and *αὐτοκάβδαλος*, on the one hand, and the Mesopotamian entertainer *aluzinnu* on the other, see West 1994: 1. Newman 1998: 106 also places the iambic poet (specifically Hipponax) in the context

choruses consist of satyrs or animals and that iambic poetry is performed dramatically (taking as evidence for this Arist. *Poet.* 1449a24-8).[62] Thus the first model closely associates choral cultic performance and invective content in the definition of iambic poetry at the time of Archilochus.

III. The Secular or Sympotic Model

West's position has caused a reaction.[63] Rösler,[64] for instance, counters that by the time of Archilochus there is already a distinction between the poetry performed at religious festivals and literary iambic poetry, such as that of Archilochus and Semonides.[65] This process of secularization is even clearer in later poets like Solon, where the political context of the performance is unambiguous.[66] The iambic poetry of Archilochus, then, should be compared to the poetry of Alcaeus, which is sympotic, although *hetaireia* in the works of the former should be understood not as a political association but rather as merely a circle of friends (cf. *Ἐρασμονίδη Χαρίλαε...πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων*, fr. 168). This group of friends creates the most appropriate context for the poet to relate his own experiences and it is here that he finds his most receptive audience.[67] In the same vein Carey, too, accepts that with Archilochus iambus has broken its cultic associations and has become an independent literary genre.[68] For Carey, the element -mb-, common in

---

of old popular festivals and processions, like that of *eiresione*, *chelidonisma*, *koronisma*, and so on, accompanied by ribaldry and insults.

[62] Lasserre 1979: 59-61. See also Adrados 1975: 315-7, who takes the inclusion of dialogues in the iambi as suggestive of a dramatic presentation, and Podlecki 1984: 40, according to whom the story of Archilochus and Dionysus points perhaps to some public performances in honor of the god, "a kind of proto-drama."

[63] See Degani's 1980: 513 reservations about West's argument, and also those of Rankin 1978: 7-27, Bonanno 1980: 65-88, Pellizer 1981: 40.

[64] Rösler 1976: 300 ff.

[65] Thus, although the main field of *αἰσχρολογία* is the contrast of the genders springing from the cult of Dionysus, Sem. 7 is no longer associated with it, see Rösler 1993: 75-97. Cf. also Lloyd-Jones' 1975: 23 reaction to Wilamowitz's suggestion that Sem. 7 is a men's reply to women's abuse uttered against them at certain religious festivals. See also Stehle 1997: 239n.100.

[66] So also Bossi 1981: 131.

[67] Cf. Nagy 1976: 191-205.

[68] Carey 1986: 65. See also Degani 1993: 14 about "deritualized" literary iambus; Bartol 1993: 66-7; Newman 1998: 101-2. Bowie 2001: 3 accepts a conceptual link

the name "Lycambes" and the terms "iambus," "ithymbus," and so on, need have no special etymological significance, since there are many words ending in *-μβος/-μβη/-μβον* without apparent connection to ritual; in addition, Lycambes' presence in the Mnesiepes inscription suggests not a stock character but a real person of influence,[69] while "Dotades" is an actual name attested by Eusebius. Moreover, the Naxian parallel of the Lycambes story is different in several important aspects.

Rösler and especially the more detailed Carey show that West's notion of direct relationship in the archaic period between literary iambus and ritual invective is precarious, and that there is no compelling evidence that the two serve the same or similar functions in society. Even sympathizers with the ritual model concede that the presence of abuse at religious occasions "says nothing about iambic verse per se."[70] To quote Bartol:

> The fact that grotesque choruses were widespread in Greece, in Doric as well as in Ionian areas, does not mean that pieces presented by them in dialogue form were identical with literary iambi. Moreover the theory concerning the influence of the so-called Doric farce, i.e., of poems recognized as dramatic composition in which some iambic content can be observed, on Attic comedy, which in turn has much in common with Ionian iambus (above all invective and obscenity) finds no confirmation either in literary or in archaeological sources.[71]

While Bartol[72] provides evidence from Aristotle for public iambic performance, the philosopher's remarks refer to the fourth century, not to the period of Archilochus. The fact is there is no strong literary or archaeological support for the synonymity of ritual abuse and literary

---

between iambi and *σκώμματα*, but he does not consider it a proof of the ritual origins of iambus.

[69] We might add here Burnett's 1983: 21-2.n.14 eloquent concerns: "Who listened to these arcane attacks and with what response? Why was the old wolf-bogey attacked in a second zoological form, as an Eagle, in 172-81W? How did he find his way into the Parian tradition concerning the settlement of Thasos? And why, if the name had been made ostensibly human by the attacks of Archilochus did the chroniclers pair him as an equal in rank and prominence with the father of his famous enemy?"

[70] Rosen 1988b: 4.

[71] Bartol 1992: 68.

[72] Cf. Semus of Delos quoted by Ath. 622b. The strongest literary evidence is taken to be *Poet.* 1459b34-7 (*τὸ γὰρ ἡρωικὸν στασιμώτατον καὶ ὀγκωδέστατον τῶν μέτρων ἐστίν...τὸ δὲ ἰαμβεῖον καὶ τετράμετρον κινητικὰ καὶ τὸ μὲν ὀρχηστικὸν τὸ δὲ πρακτικόν*), cf. Bartol 1992: 66.

iambus. There also seems to be no convincing evidence that the iambic poets wore masks, a phallus, or any distinguishing costume.[73] Some iambic poetry might have been presented chorally but it is quite doubtful that choral performance goes back to the archaic period.[74] In fact, the extant verses strongly suggest one performer rather than a group, since almost all the direct speeches are introduced or concluded with certain expressions that imbed them within a narrative (for instance, *ἠμειβόμην*, 23.7; *ἀνταμειβόμην*, 196a.9; *τοσαῦτ' ἐφώνει*, 196a.9). Even if we allow for some cases in which a dialogue is not framed by a narrative,[75] the monodic poet possesses a variety of devices (gestures, expression, mimicry and such) that enable him to deliver a lively and coherent recitation.[76] The importance of role playing/acting becomes even greater as we begin to realize that the first person cannot always be taken as referring to the poet himself: assumption of a persona, sometimes even that of a female, must involve some kind of movement, facial expression, or other trick on the performer's part. In other words, even if iambus contains occasional elements that suggest performance, there is no reason to understand it as performed by a group, since the monodic poet himself has the means for an effective delivery of such dialogic poetry.[77]

---

[73] Bowie 2002:39. See also Burnett 1983: 31.

[74] Bartol 1993: 69-70.

[75] There is only one example of a dialogue occurring without the presence of an introductory or concluding formula, Hip. 25: "*ἀπό σ' ὀλέσειεν Ἄρτεμις.*"–"*σὲ δὲ κὠπόλλων.*" The fragment, however, is too short to be conclusive.

[76] Although some aspects of the iambic performance remain obscure, it is generally agreed that verses in iambic meter were presented in *παρακαταλογή* ("a type of rendition that may be compared, musically and technically, to the plain [*secco*] recitative of modern opera"), Gentili 1988: 35; also Herington 1985:38-9; Bartol 1992: 70-1.

[77] On impersonation and character acting by the monodic poet, cf. Rossi 1983: 41-50; Herington 1985: 53-4; Gentili 1988: 32-49; Bartol 1992: 68-9 on the aural and visual aspects of presentation (*λέξις* and *ὄψις*). Lysanias' reference to iambic performances by the verb *ὑποκρίνεσθαι* (Ath. 620c) should not be understood as indicating necessarily a dramatic performance, because the verb also means "explain," "interpret," or simply "deliver," see Bartol 1992: 70-1. On the performance aspects of poetry at the symposium, cf. Puppini 1986: 39-52, esp. 44 ff. on Archilochus: "It is during its long evolution that the symposium had the opportunity to filter and elaborate on the various mimetic elements which eventually produce typical *ἀκροάματα* …Fr. 196a is a good example of a narrative composition connected with mime: it is brief, and contains dialogue, dramatic language, and discusses everyday events" (with references to Gallavotti, who understands frr. 19 and 122 as authentic mimes, "*veri e propri mimi…non a dialogo…bensi monologhi*").

In summary, the "secularists" define archaic literary iambus as a non-cultic kind of monodic poetry distinguished by its metrical form regardless of content. Thus while it is difficult to argue against the possibility of distant cultic roots for the iambic genre, it is the opinion of the author that by the time of Archilochus, iambus has developed an independent and secular identity as a monodic form of poetry. At least that much can be said. Whether content or meter serves as a further determinant will be examined subsequently.

Against the attestations of a connection between cult and archaic literary iambus, one could argue that explicit and implicit indications point to a different setting of performance, one which the author would claim is the symposium. By way of implicit indicators, we may examine the following two that distinguish archaic iambus from its cult-related predecessors: its mixed origins, which are not the pure product of a cultic iambic past; and its thematic breadth, which can run from sexual and invective to philosophical or socio-political themes and also to mundane aspects of domestic life. We will consider the latter issues at length in Chapter Two, but let us examine here the question of origins outside of the earlier cultic iambus.

IV. Epic Elements

No longer a mere liturgical form, archaic iambus behaves like a genuinely literary genre, displaying dynamism and interaction with other genres of the poetic past through verbal and conceptual influences. Semonides' aphorism, for instance, about the value of good and bad wives (fr. 6) echoes very closely Hesiod's *Op*. 702-3.[78] The similarity is too strong to be considered the result of the general attitudes in archaic society toward women and reveals a conscious literary reference on Semonides' part.[79] Archilochus, too, seems to have been heavily

[78] Sem. 6: *γυναικὸς οὐδὲν χρῆμ᾽ ἀνὴρ ληΐζεται*
ἐσθλῆς ἄμεινον οὐδὲ ῥίγιον κακῆς.
Op. 702-3: *οὐ μὲν γάρ τι γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ ληίζετ᾽ ἄμεινον*
τῆς ἀγαθῆς, τῆς δ᾽ αὖτε κακῆς οὐ ῥίγιον ἄλλο.
Cf. also Sem. 7.110 which presents close similarities to *Op*. 701.

[79] Fränkel 1975: 204 takes Semonides' literary dependence for granted. See also Brown 1997: 72-3 for the affinities and interplay of Sem. 1 and 7 with Hesiodic poetry. Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 191-2 see close parallels between fr. 24 and *Od.* 14.73-7, 14.416 ff. The resemblance makes them think that Semonides had very

influenced by Homer, both in terms of individual ideas and of expression.[80] Page[81] has made clear the verbal debt of Archilochus to Homer, and conversely in recent years a number of studies have increased our awareness of the presence of "iambic" (abusive) elements in both epic poets. See for instance Dobson:

> The defining characteristics of iambic poetry—invective, sex, deception, misogyny and scatological humor—are vital elements of archaic epic. In epic, just as in iambic poetry, these characteristics are important determiners of status for individual characters and means by which bonds are formed and maintained among members of social groups. Both individuals and groups use "iambic" tactics in order to assert and enact their own social superiority and simultaneously marginalize their opponents, who are often women or men equated with women.[82]

In the *Iliad*, Thersites is certainly the victim *par excellence* of abuse,[83] and in the *Odyssey* even Odysseus himself on occasion comes close to becoming a comic character.[84] The ridicule of objectionable actions does not leave even the gods immune, if we are to judge from the

---

clearly in his mind the whole Homeric passage. See also their comments on Sem. 20. Lloyd-Jones' 1975: 20 *caveat* seems to be overcautious here.

[80] Examples:

Arch. 25.2: *ἀλλ᾽ ἄλλος ἄλλωι καρδίην ἰαίνεται.* *Od.* 14.228: *ἄλλος γάρ τ᾽ ἄλλοισιν ἀνὴρ ἐπιτέρπεται ἔργοις.*

Arch. 110: *† ἔρξω· ἐτήτυμον γὰρ ξυνὸς ἀνθρώποις Ἄρης.* *Il.* 18.309: *ξυνὸς Ἐνυάλιος· καί τε κτανέοντα κατέκτα.*

Arch. 111: *καὶ νέους θάρσυνε· νίκης δ᾽ ἐν θεοῖσι πείρατα.* *Il.* 7.102: *νίκης πείρατ᾽ ἔχονται ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.*

For epic passages imitated in lyric poetry (iambic meters included), see Fowler 1987: 20-53. Campbell in his commentary (1967) offers a great number of Homeric and Hesiodic parallels, some closer than others. Fowler 1987: 33 draws attention to the complexities of imitation by the early poets, especially since it is not certain that a fixed text existed at the time. Many of the poems in iambic meter have an epic flavor but no specific reference to Homer or Hesiod.

[81] Page 1963: 117-64.

[82] Dobson 2003: 5. The aggressive tradition in the epics is, to a certain extent, a reflection of the general Greek attitude of helping one's friends and harming one's enemies, cf. Blundell 1989: 26. For the displays of anger in epics and in archaic Greek poetry, see Adkin 1969: 21; Parks 1990: 3-41 (discussion of Greek and non-Greek literatures); also Harris 2001: 153-4. For the Perses poem of Hesiod's *Works and Days* as a "true iambus," see Lennartz 2000b: 228.

[83] Nagy 1979: 279-80. Thalmann 1988: 21; Rosen 2003: 134.

[84] Arnould 1989: 514: "*Dans l'*Odyssé *Ulysse évolue constamment aux frontières de la μαργότης, dans son triple sens d'intempérance sexuelle et de voracité, d'un côté…de folie, de l'autre.*"

laughter against Ares and Aphrodite, which may reveal not just amusement but mockery.[85] Clearly the iambic poets looked with particular interest at these aggressive elements in epic. Rosen[86] has shown that Hipponax, in creating his own poetic persona, especially in the Bupalus narratives takes as his model Odysseus, who, although usually the underdog, conceals great intellectual and athletic capabilities.[87] Sem. 7, with its list of animal-women, may be a parody of the genre of the *Catalogue of Women*,[88] and Hipponax's mischievous use of the epic past may also be attested in fr. 128, in which the solemn opening of the *Odyssey* is turned into a burlesque of gastronomical abuse.[89] An indication of the fascination with the iambic possibilities of epic is *Margites* (date uncertain; sixth century?), which reflects a peculiar metrical synergy between the two genres (hexameters interrupted by iambic lines) having as their subject matter the marital difficulties of a foolish man.[90] The ascription of *Margites* to Homer, while erroneous, demonstrates the ancient understanding of abuse's role in the most hallowed epic.

Thus we see that the iambus of Archilochus' day is much more consciously literary than its cultic predecessor are likely to have been and is actually in content and manner molded by epic ancestors as well as iambic ones. Since the genre itself has evolved radically, there is no reason to expect its performance to have remained the same.

V. Direct References to a Sympotic Setting

There is, in addition to these oblique indications, direct internal evidence that iambus is performed at the symposium, the place where, as is increasingly recognized, the greatest part of archaic monody is per-

---

[85] See Brown 1989: 287-8 on *ἄσβεστος γέλως* (*Od.* 8.326) which may be compared to the public *γέλως* generated by the actions of Lycambes (fr. 172).

[86] Rosen 1990: 11.

[87] For Odyssean elements in Archilochus see also Latte 1964: 385 ff.; A. Aloni. 1981: 112-7. Also Russo 1974: 139-52, who argues for the close proximity of the two generals (fr. 114) to Homer's world, and Seidensticker 1978: 5-22; Worman 2002: 85. For a more sceptical view, see Toohey 1988: 1-14.

[88] Loraux 1993: 109.

[89] Although without the need to see allusions to religious sacrificial ritual, as in Hawkins 2003: 62.

[90] Nagy 1979: 259 ff; Barron and Easterling 1985: 109-10; also Griffiths 1995: 107n.29.

formed.[91] The addresses of Archilochus to the same individuals in both the elegies (certainly performed at the symposium) and iambus are an excellent indication that the latter's context of performance is probably the same as that of the former.[92] Glaucus, identified as a military companion of the poet, is the recipient of gnomic advice in the elegies (15)[93] and is also addressed in the trimeters (48.7). Similarly, Pericles, the addressee in elegiac frr. 13 and 16, appears again in the same capacity in the trochaic tetrameter fr. 124 and possibly in the iambic trimeter fr. 28.4. But in addition to this significant permeability between elegy and iambus, there are specific references (admittedly inspiring a variable degree of confidence) that suggest a sympotic context for iambus as well:

Archilochus:
In Arch. 124 the speaker reproaches Pericles for coming uninvited to the drinking party and behaving in a boorish way:

> *πολλὸν δὲ πίνων καὶ χαλίκρητον μέθυ,*
> *οὔτε τῖμον εἰσενείκας* < - υ - x - υ - >
> *οὐδὲ κληθεὶς* < υ - x > *ἦλθες οἷα δὴ φίλος,*
> *ἀλλά σεο γαστὴρ νόον τε καὶ φρένας παρήγαγεν*
> *εἰς ἀναιδείην*

The poem not only depicts a sympotic situation (*πίνων*) but also makes clear that it is performed at the symposium (*ἦλθες*): specific references indicate that the event is a closed drinking gathering reserved for friends only (invitation needed, *κληθείς*), wherein each contributes

---

[91] Pavese 1972: 250; Lloyd-Jones 1975: 13; Rösler 1976: 300-4; Burnett 1983: 8 (recognizing also the importance of women's circles); Herrington 1985: 38; Murray 1990: 9; Pellizer 1990: 180; Bowie 1993: 8. For the view that the archaic invective is an expression in the private sphere with an eye, however, to public events, cf. Koster 1980: 61-2.

[92] Bowie 2002: 38 thinks that the regular addressing of named individuals suggests performance in a sympotic context where all or at least most of the participants were expected to take their turn. Rösler 1985: 139-40 underlines the immediacy of the poetic discourse and the shared knowledge which reveal the degree of the group's intimacy. See also Lloyd-Jones 1975: 13. For an alternative setting of the iambic performance, see Bowie 1993: 7-8, who claims that just as long narrative elegies were intended for a formal public occasion (in detail in Bowie 1986: 13-35) so were long trimeter and tetrameter narratives; but he concedes that he knows of "no evidence to determine their intended context of performance."

[93] Glaucus is mentioned in a gnomic and military context also in the tetrameters (frr. 96, 105, 117, 131).

towards the common expenses (*τῖμον*).[94] The intensely sharp language (note the characterization of Pericles as *ἀναιδής*) makes this poem much more like those referred to by West as "true iambus" than the playful badinage of social gatherings, like the teasing of Leophilus (fr. 115) or the address to Charilaus (fr. 168).[95] Fr. 124 is a clear example of iambic poetry in the narrower, abusive sense performed in a sympotic—not ritual—context.

There are two other fragments that suggest sympotic context, although the poorly preserved texts do not permit a high degree of confidence: Arch. 48, addressed to Glaucus, contains a reference to food (*δαῖτα*, 2), use of perfumes (*ἐσμυρισμένας κόμην καὶ στῆθος*, 5-6) and women (*ἐσμυρισμένας*, 5; *πᾶσαι*, 22). Wearing perfumes is attested as a sympotic practice and so is the presence of women.[96] In Arch. 58 the speaker appears to reproach someone as shameless (*ὀφρύκνηστον*, 10) while he himself (*ἐμεωυτο*, 11) sings to the accompaniment of the *aulos* player (*ἄειδων ὑπ' αὐλητῆρος*). Although the symposium is not the only setting of *aulos* performances, it is nevertheless the most common. In two unarguably sympotic passages Theognis uses expressions almost identical to that of Archilochus.[97]

Semonides:

The poetry of Semonides contains no metasympotic language or other direct references linking it to a drinking party (or any other kind of context). But its general outlook, with its strong elegiac tendencies, directs us toward a sympotic setting. As Pellizer and Tedeschi[98] note, elements such as addresses to friends and enemies, affectionate advice to an *eromenos*, and melancholy reflection on the brevity of youth and human life in general leave no option but to assume the symposium as

---

[94] For the sympotic practice of contributing the *τῖμος*, cf. Murray 1982: 50.

[95] Pericles elsewhere is presented as a companion (frr. 13, 16). Nagy 1979: 244 makes the distinction between abuse aimed at friends and that aimed at enemies. Archilochus' abusive practices toward his friends, however, are attested by Critias: *ὁμοίως τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς κακῶς ἔλεγε* (fr. 295). Presumably Critias should have been able to distinguish playful and real abuse, cf. Rosen 1988a: 13, who understands Archilochus's *psogos* as indiscriminate abuse, and thus a perversion of the general principle "love your friends, hate your enemies."

[96] For perfumes, cf. Alc. 50 P; for the presence of women, cf. Anacr. 427 P.

[97] *χαίρω δ' εὖ πίνων καὶ ὑπ' αὐλητῆρος ἀείδων* (533).
ἔστι δὲ κωμάζοντα μετ' αὐλητῆρος ἀείδειν (1065).

On the use of the *aulos* in the symposium, cf. West 1974: 12-4 and 1992: 25; Barker 1984: 50ff.

[98] Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: xxix-xxxn.1.

the setting of performance. The sympotic possibilities of fr. 7 have not passed unnoticed either: Osborne[99] imagines a situation where a single singer turns from one companion to another as he talks about their different wives, or divides the poem up among symposiasts around the room, each capping the others' descriptions. Stehle[100] sees fr. 7 as a process of distancing the speaker and listeners from their spouses, while transforming the symposium into an alternative world safe from the necessity of dealing with women.

Solon:
In the poetry of Solon, there is virtually no thematic distinction between his elegies and iambi, and hence both seem to have been performed in the same setting. That the setting of his elegies is sympotic is indicated not only by their general character but also by a specific metasympotic reference (*παρούσας / εὐφροσύνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἡσυχίηι*, 4.9-10).[101] Solon's elegies frequently mention his actions as a lawgiver and social reformer, but they also contain gnomic advice and exhortations to his fellow citizens in a manner typical of the other aristocratic elegists. References to *εὐφροσύνη*, as in fr. 26, are usually found to be sympotic.[102] Fr. 15, with its distinction between *ἀγαθοί* and *κακοί* and its preference for the permanent quality of *ἀρετή* over the unpredictable state of *πλοῦτος* and *χρήματα*, reveals clearly an aristocratic ideology: the lines are identical to Thgn. 315-8, the con-

[99] Osborne 2001: 53n.18.

[100] Stehle 1997: 238. For a different understanding of the performance setting of fr. 7 (*gamelia*, wedding-banquet), see Schear 1984: 39-49.

[101] In a recent discussion of the passage, Mülke 2002: 115-8 suggests that although *δαίς* may indicate a more open and more inclusive feasting, like that of phratry or cult festivity, the symposium should be preferred as the context of performance, since *εὐφροσύνη*, *ἡσυχίη*, and *κόσμος* are primarily associated with this setting. Maehler, Noussia, and Fantuzzi 2001: 244 underline the civic connotations of these terms, pointing out that they are not simply guidelines for a well-ordered symposium but also important principles for an orderly polis ("*valenze politiche*"); for instance, *ἡσυχίη* in Pindar is the daughter of Dike (*Pyth*. 8.1-2). See also Noussia 2001: 357. Cf. fr. 26: *ἔργα δὲ Κυπρογενοῦς νῦν μοι φίλα καὶ Διονύσου / καὶ Μουσέων, ἃ τίθησ' ἀνδράσιν εὐφροσύνας*. See Tedeschi 1982: 33-46; Loeffler 1993: 33; Stehle 1997: 260. Solon's Salamis elegy (frr. 1-3), despite its potential reference to a perforance in the *ἀγορά*, seems also to have been performed at the symposium, cf. Bartol 1993: 54-5, Mülke 2002: 74-5, and especially Maehler, Noussia, and Fantuzzi 2001: 226-9, who think that Solon may have even used proper paraphernalia (mask; a certain type of hat, *πιλίδιον*) to convey his message in the most convincing way.

[102] Thgn. 1068; Anacr. el. 2; Xenoph. B1.

text of which is sympotic.[103] By virtue of their commonalities with the elegiac fragments at various levels, we may assume with confidence that Solon's iambic fragments are also performed at the symposium.[104]

Hipponax:
The poetry of Hipponax contains no references linking it to a particular setting. Hip. 115, a violent invective against a former *hetairos*, may suggest a symposium in that the opposition between the outside enemies and the members of the *hetaireia*, presented as a unified group, becomes on occasion a sympotic theme, as in Alcaeus.[105]

The presence, then, of the same addressees, similar thematic motifs and self-references to drinking wine in both elegy and iambus point to a shared setting of performance, which can be none other than the symposium. A significant part of metric iambus, of course, is geared less toward reflection and more toward entertainment, but this should hardly be surprising in a convivial situation. In fact the presence of jesting and joking in the symposium is attested by the anonymous fr. 27:

> *χαίρετε συμπόται ἄνδρες ὁμ.... ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ γὰρ*
> *ἀρξάμενος τελέω τὸν λόγον εἰς ἀγαθόν.*
> *χρὴ δ', ὅταν εἰς τοιοῦτο συνέλθωμεν φίλοι ἄνδρες*
> *πρᾶγμα, γελᾶν παίζειν χρησαμένους ἀρετῆι,*
> *ἥδεσθαί τε συνόντας, ἐς ἀλλήλους τε φλυαρεῖν*
> *καὶ σκώπτειν τοιαῦθ' οἷα γέλωτα φέρειν. κτλ.*

The poem makes no specific reference to iambic poetry; yet, although abuse may occur elsewhere, it is more frequently found in iambus. Even if the term *σκώπτειν* (6) has different connotations that may fit into different genres, the fact is that it also appears in iambus; and just as in the case of the Hymn to Demeter, in which the *σκώμματα* of Iambe cause the goddess *μειδῆσαι γελάσαι καὶ ἵλαον σχεῖν θυμόν*, here, too, one purpose of sympotic *σκώμματα* is to generate laughs and provide entertainment. Iambus provides a strong agonistic or

---

[103] See Melissano 1994: 49-58 and Duplouy 1999: 1-22.

[104] For the metasympotic nature of the culinary iambic frr. 38-40, see below on *Food/Eating* and Maehler, Noussia, and Fantuzzi 2001: 371: "It is exactly these verses and the poem (or poems) from which they derive that may be among the reasons Solon, as the interlocutor of Aesop in Alexis' famous comedy of the same title, is later chosen to underline the superiority of Attic sympotic customs."

[105] Cf. also Stehle 1997: 225-6.

confrontational matrix in which mockery and obscenity are more permissable than in other genres.[106] Although its ideal is entertainment in an orderly and civilized manner (*χρησαμένους ἀρετῆι*, 4), the symposium may be threatened by real or perceived insults and subsequent quarrels. Thgn. 491-6 offers eloquent testimony to this reality.[107] One of the major functions of abusive and obscene discourse in the symposium (besides entertainment) is to release the tensions within the group and ensure the preservation of its harmony and unity,[108] much the same function as cultic abuse serves for the city as a whole.

West's distinction between "true" and "not true" iambi suggests a sharper thematic division between the two groups than that which actually exists: although there are many poems that can easily be classified as abusive or not, there are others the character of which is ambivalent. Even West himself admits that it is difficult to say how much is iambus in the narrow sense and how much is the gentler, witty teasing permissible in ordinary social intercourse, pointing out certain poems, such as Arch. 24 and 114, which can go either way. West's distinction, in fact, gives a new spin to questions with wide implications for our understanding of the particular poems: is Sem. 7 plain and simple invective, or poetry that utilizes various philosophical principles of Thales, such as the idea of materials or quasi-materials, in representing the female qualities, as Fränkel has suggested?[109] Is it possible that the poem can be both invective and philosophical? Similarly, is the comparison of the two generals in Arch. 114 a reflection on the proper qualities of military leadership in the abstract or an attack against a particular individual? A distinction between "true" and "non-true" iambus brings questions of this sort to center stage with greater urgency, creating strains and ambivalences of definition that fre-

---

[106] Pellizer 1983a: 32. Rosen 2003: 132-3 (with reference to Adrados 1975: 279) describes the symposium as possessing the "quality of a closed society with agonal and sporting elements."

[107] Cf. Stehle 1997: 223. Pellizer 1983a: 35 interpets certain fragments, for instance, Hip. 120 (*λάβετέ μεο ταἰμάτια, κόψω Βουπάλωι τὸν ὀφθαλμόν*) and Arch. 125: (*μάχης δὲ τῆς σῆς, ὥστε διψέων πιεῖν, / ὣς ἐρέω*) as potentially sympotic, referring to occasions in which fighting breaks out (although he acknowledges the possibility that the fragments may be erotic, cf. Anacreon's fights with Eros).

[108] Pellizer 1981: 40 ff. and 1983a: 31-41.

[109] Fränkel 1975: 205-6. See also, for instance, Gerber 1970: 57, who takes the poem as "at least half-serious."

quently remain unresolved and that in reality can only be made sense of through extra-textual considerations, namely ritual or non-ritual context of performance.[110]

VI. Settling on a Definition

The difficulties in choosing objective criteria for the definition of a genre are notorious,[111] but in spite of this there has traditionally been a distinct tendency in modern scholarship to recognize the primacy of content.[112] In recent years, however, this approach has been heavily modified by considerations of poetic function and setting of performance.[113] Willi's remarks are indicative of the reorientation:

> Even if two genres employ a similar range of vocabulary, they may still be entirely different in social function, but a category such as "social function" is far more difficult to handle because it cannot simply be quantified. "Context of situation" stresses the relation between social setting –and in particular "participation frameworks" and textual forms of genres. If two genres have a similar context of situation (i.e. if the addressor and addressees as well as the modes and aims of communication are similar), a generic link can be postulated more easily.[114]

---

[110] A refreshingly different approach to the nature of iambus has been offered by E. Bowie 2001: 26, who sets forth as identifying features of the genre narrative, speeches embedded in narrative, etc., among them *psogos*. He points out, however, that there is no evidence that "the presence of abuse was a necessary condition for a poem being termed iambos," Bowie 2001: 5. See also Aloni 1981: 8 about the limited significance of content in the identification of literary genres in the archaic period.

[111] Calame 1974: 114: "*...on s'est rapidement aperçu qu'il était difficile de reconnaître un fondement objectif aux lois et aux élements definis comme distinctifs d'un genre littéraire. Le fait est que les genres littéraires n'ont de realité que dans les œuvres qu'ils subsument et les critères de classification des œuvres en genres varient selon les analystes.*"

[112] For instance, Cairns 1972: 6; West 1974: 22-39; Nagy 1979: 243; Pellizer 1981: 35-9. In Cairn's classification, genres are "primary elements" normally composed of "secondary elements" or *topoi*, which may be common to more than one genre. All the genres "originate in important recurrent, real-life situations" (70). This introduces, of course, an element of considerable subjectivity as to when a situation becomes a genre, and from whose point of view, cf. Quinn 1973: 403-7.

[113] Conte 1994: 106-7: "A category of genre based exclusively upon formal features is clearly unacceptable (e.g., dialect). But it is just as dangerous, and more common in recent studies, to think of genre as a typology founded exclusively upon recurring contents: *topoi*, repeated themes and motifs, situations."

[114] Willi 2002: 7-8.

This emphasis on the performance aspect is a welcome development, especially if we take into consideration the fact that archaic Greek culture was an oral one, and thus a poem existed not in the fixed form of a written text but through its presentation. Behind the delivered words lay assumptions about the mode of communication appropriate to a particular occasion, which determined other factors as well, such as location, speakers and addressees.[115]

In this study, "iambus" will denote poetry composed in iambic meter, whether trimeters, tetrameters or epodes, regardless of content. Whether iambus thus defined is a genre *per se* or simply a metrical form may be, after all, a question of technicality, and the answer depends on the criteria one uses for his definitions. If the setting of performance is used as the sole criterion, it is obvious that iambus is a sympotic genre and as such cannot be distinguished from other kinds of poetry also performed at the symposium (for instance, elegy), unless some further element is added to the criteria, such as meter.[116] Content, we have already suggested, is too varied to rank as a criterion, and this variety will be further examined in Chapter Two. In any case, archaic literary iambus represents a body of poetry unified by context of performance, means of presentation and meter, and as such should be treated holistically as an independent entity. Let us call this entity genre.[117]

VII. The Changing Face of Archaic Literary Iambus

Iambus enjoys its heyday in the archaic period. Although its roots almost certainly stretch back even earlier, the scholars of antiquity considered Archilochus and Semonides to be its inventors.[118] The extant corpus of archaic iambus covers a little more than the span of a century (mid-seventh to the third quarter of the sixth centuries), representing three successive generations of poets: Archilochus and Semonides; Solon; and Hipponax. The canon traditionally is understood without

---

[115] See Rossi 1971: 71; Dougherty 1994: 43; Depew and Obbink 2000: 3. Also Bowie 1993: 36 on the unspoken assumptions surrounding a particular act of delivery.

[116] See also Calame 1974: 120-1; Bartol 1993: 31.

[117] "Form" might be less controversial than "genre" but it has so many other meanings that it would be confusing.

[118] Ps. Plut. *De Mus.* 28.1141a; Al. *Strom.* 1.79.1 Stählin.

Solon, but this exclusion reflects the criteria of later times, when iambus was understood primarily in its abusive aspect.[119] The chronology of Archilochus is well established, since he is a contemporary of Gyges.[120] Semonides, too, should be placed in the same time period, although there is some ambiguity, arisen primarily from the fact that on occasion ancient sources confuse him with Simonides.[121] Solon was active in the early part of the sixth century, for we know that he served as an archon at Athens in 594/3.[122] Hipponax, too, may be dated with reasonable certainty, his *floruit* placed in the third quarter of the sixth century.[123]

From the middle of the seventh century down to the time of Hipponax iambus undergoes certain transformations, as the individual poets adjust it to the needs of the poetic world they want to create and adapt it to "the various cultural discourses and social functions within which literature operates."[124] Although the most fundamental change of function in iambus occurs with its transition from cult song to sympotic poetry (certainly before Archilochus and Semonides),[125] the more general literary developments encourage a number of other substantial changes as well. It has been claimed that the shape of iambic poetry is

---

[119] Cf., for instance, Proclus ap. Phot. *bibl.* (v.158.27 Henry): *ἰάμβων δὲ ποιηταὶ Ἀρχίλοχός τε ὁ Πάριος ἄριστος καὶ Σιμωνίδης ὁ Ἀμόργιος ἤ, ὡς ἔνιοι, Σάμιος καὶ Ἱππῶναξ ὁ Ἐφέσιος.*

[120] Cf. *Γύγης τοῦ καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ὁ Πάριος κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον γενόμενος* (Hdt. 1.12); also, Tatian, *ad Craecos* 31; Proclus, see previous note. See also Lavelle's 2002: 350 arguments for Archilochus' date based on the testimony of Herodotus and the connotations of *ἐπίκουρος* and *Κάρ* in fr. 216.

[121] Hubbard 1994: 175 argues that Semonides' depiction of the earth-woman and sea-woman (7.21-42) reflects a stage in the evolution of elemental theory quite inconceivable for the seventh century, but more consistent with the late sixth; contrast Fränkel 1975: 205-6. Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: xvii place the poet in the first half of the seventh century, conceding that it is impossible to tell whether he is contemporary or even earlier than Archilochus. See also Gerber 1970: 53; Pellizer 1983b: 17-28.

[122] See Anhalt 1993: 1 ff. with relevant bibliography.

[123] Plin. *NH* 36.4.11: *quem* (i.e., Hipponax) *certum est LX Olympiade fuisse,* that is, 540-537; Ps. Plut. *De Mus.* 6.1133d: *φαίνεται δ' Ἱππώνακτος καὶ Περίκλειτος ὢν πρεσβύτερος*. See Gerber 1999: 342 with reference to Lasserre.

[124] Depew and Obbink 2000: 3. See also Most's 2000: 15-35 remarks on how different generations of poets focus on different aspects of genre, thus generating an ever-changing perception of a certain type of literature.

[125] For the retention of some of the old ritual elements of iambus in its new status as entertainment poetry, see Bartol 1992: 66. The co-existence of both religious and secular elements in the symposium has been pointed out by Adrados 1975: 279; for an opposite view see Osborne 2001: 54, with reference to Schmitt-Pantel 1990: 17.

determined above all by Archilochus and that the iambic mood, temper and character are homogeneous,[126] but the present study hopes to show that archaic literary iambus is not so monolithic. In the following chapters, we attempt to trace certain changes and postulate their relationship with the new (dramatic) genres being generated within archaic Greek poetry. We argue that with the passing of time the overall identity of iambus undergoes an important transformation through changes in the prioritization of its thematic motifs and also through reorientation of its techniques of presentation. Since the concern of this study is the diachronic development of archaic iambus, its focus inevitably falls on the trimeters, which are the only iambic form appearing in all three generations of the poets under consideration and which thus provide us with a tolerable corpus of *comparanda*. The tetrameters and epodes on the other hand survive virtually only in the poetry of Archilochus, a fact that makes an examination through time precarious, even by the most relaxed standards.[127] By necessity, then, this study limits itself to the iambic trimeters.

Chapter Two examines the thematic elements of the trimeters. While there are a number of themes that appear in most poets and seem to be part of the generic kernel, others are associated with iambus only temporarily: some appear only in the early period and are never seen again; others are treated by Hipponax in a way quite different from that of his predecessors. These changes deserve close consideration because they are the traces of the evolution of the genre. We will argue that in terms of subject matter Hipponax is different from the earlier iambic poets primarily because he does not contain serious reflection, and we will speculate on what this indicates.

Chapter Three attempts to show that a) while in Archilochus and Semonides the "I" and "you" are variable and inconsistent, in Solon and Hipponax they are predictable and consistent; b) the subject of the verb in the third person is often impersonal in Archilochus and Semonides, and always in Solon, but almost never in Hipponax; c) the percentage of "I" and/or "we" as subject of the verb changes: while in Archilochus and perhaps Semonides the first person is the main agent, in Hipponax its importance is significantly reduced (with Solon acting

[126] Cf. Kerkhecker 1999: 4.

[127] In the tetrameters Solon survives in twenty-one lines (three fragments) and Hipponax, in six lines; in the epodes, the only poetry postdating Archilochus comes from Hipponax (fewer than thirty-five lines).

as a transition). Conversely, the rates of the third person, modest in the first generation, rise dramatically in Hipponax; d) while Archilochus and Semonides contain rates of verbs expressing feeling, attitude, cognition and perception equaling or even surpassing those of verbs of physical action, Hipponax reduces the former while drastically increasing the latter; and e) the first two generations contain nouns signifying abstractions (political and social conditions, human and divine forces, mental processes and so on) at rates much higher than that of Hipponax, while the reverse is true regarding artifactual nouns, especially those associated with everyday life. We take these changes in Hipponax as expressions of the absence of serious generalized subject matter and of exclusive focus on the concrete, private and domestic world.

Chapter Four makes a comparison between elegy and iambus: during the first two generations, the two have much in common, particularly in terms of themes and use of person. With the appearance of Hipponax, however, we observe a divergence of the two genres, because he breaks away from the tradition of elegiac aspects of iambus. The departure is decisive and reflected in his poetic milieu, themes, persona, vocabulary and modes of presentation.

Chapter Five examines whether the differences observed in the poetry of Hipponax represent a wider development in iambic poetry or are simply a personal trait of an idiosyncratic poet. That the former is the case is suggested by two considerations: a) while down to the middle of the sixth century epigrams (epitaphs and dedications), when not in hexameter, are composed either in elegiac or iambic meter, after this point they are composed with conspicuously greater frequency in elegiac, as if iambic is no longer appropriate; and b) a number of later iambic poets (late sixth-fifth centuries) who survive in only a few verses give the impression that the non-elegiac element is the prevailing characteristic of their poetries.

The chapter then attempts to explain the thematic narrowing of iambus as well as the disappearance of the iambic epigram in the middle of the sixth century. It suggests that these developments may be connected with the birth of tragedy, for we know that from the beginning tragedy uses iambic meter and that the first tragic contest in Athens takes place ca. 535 B.C.E., approximately the time of the thematic narrowing of iambus. While down to the middle of the sixth century the archaic iambus is a Janus-like kind of poetry, with the appearance

of tragedy one of its faces is lost. Perhaps the iambic poets felt that the space traditionally occupied by serious iambus was now taken by the new genre; and either they adopted tragedy, or if they continued to write non-dramatic iambic verses, they focused on the abusive elements. The energy of the narrowed (Hipponactean) iambus later fuels comedy, as is well recognized.

CHAPTER TWO

THEMATIC ELEMENTS OF THE TRIMETERS

Ideally, a thematic element should be considered a convention of the archaic trimeters if found in all four poets under consideration. Such a requirement, however, presupposes corpora more extensive than the ones we actually possess: the trimeters of Archilochus consist of seventy fragments, twenty-five of which are mutilated to the point of containing no complete words; of the forty-two fragments of Semonides, twelve are glosses; of the five fragments of Solon, one is textually uncertain; and of Hipponax's one hundred and fourteen fragments, thirty are completely unintelligible.

Under the circumstances, it seems more practical to make allowances for accidents of preservation and accept as genre conventions thematic elements appearing in only two poets, although there are a few of them that occur in all four poets and still more that occur in three. The more widespread a thematic element diachronically, the stronger the indication that it is one of the established conventions of the genre. In the discussion that follows, the themes of the trimeters are divided into groups according to whether they appear in the first generation alone, the first two generations or in all three generations. No thematic element is confined to the last two generations alone, although, as we suggest later, a number of established themes are treated by Hipponax in a noticeably different manner. On several occasions an element occurs in a corpus only marginally (for instance, military and mythological themes), but it is nevertheless mentioned for reasons of documentation. In this sense, the arrangement of themes in the first part of this chapter is provisional. Their relevance, however, is evaluated at the end of the chapter under "General Observations," where an adjusted classification is provided.

A convention is considered permanent if it appears in at least two poets, one of whom belongs to the earliest generation (Archilochus, Semonides) and the other is Hipponax (latest generation). In other words, occurrence at both the beginning and the end of the period un-

der study is taken to imply a continuous use of the element across the time between. An element is considered to be an early convention if it appears in both poets of the first generation, or one/two poet(s) of the first generation and Solon, but not Hipponax.

A *caveat* is appropriate here: one should always keep in mind when examining the corpus of trimeters the scarcity and brevity of fragments, in combination with their poor state of preservation and the fact that they come down to us mostly without context. Thus the data and statistics below should be understood as providing tendencies and indications rather than precisions. This impediment, however, cannot diminish the basic value of the information, which, although containing gaps, is fundamentally reliable, especially in the case of Hipponax, whose corpus contains the largest number of fragments.

I. Early Thematic Elements

A. *Only in the First Generation*

Animal Fable

Archilochus:
His trimeters contain five references to animals, three of which are clearly made in passing.[1] Fr. 41 is a reference to a *κορώνη* who (*ὥσπερ*) *κηρύλος / πέτρης ἐπὶ προβλῆτος ἀπτερύσσετο*, a shearwater shaking her wings lasciviously like a kingfisher. The fact that the poet elaborates on her behavior with a simile makes it rather unlikely that she herself is the object of comparison for yet another (human) character (a woman behaving like a *κορώνη* behaving like a *κηρύλος*). In fact, in terms of narrative, the *κορώνη* must be important enough for the poet to draw attention to her behavior with figurative language. The kind of poetry in which animals are the characters, standing for certain traits and substituting for humans, is the animal fable (*αἶνος*), which the speaker on occasion adopts when his address is paraenetic

[1] In fr. 21 Thasos is compared to the back of a donkey, and in fr. 43 an enemy's penis is likened to that of the same animal. In fr. 23.16 *μύρμηξ* may also be a simile (there is a lacuna in the place where we might see the conjunction *ἅτε*: a man addressing a female asserts to her his ability to respond according to the actions of the others, likening himself to an ant. See Slings 1982: 69-70 and 1983: 31-6.

in a polemical way.[2] The earliest animal fable we possess is that of the hawk and the nightingale, appearing in Hesiod, by which the speaker censures Perses for taking advantage of him.[3] The *κορώνη* of fr. 41 appears to be written about as a substitute for a lascivious woman (cf. *ὑφ᾽ ἡδονῆς σαλευομένη,* in the testimonia) who becomes the target of the poet.[4]

Fr. 35 also has the air of an animal fable:

βοῦς ἐστιν ἡμῖν ἐργάτης ἐν οἰκίῃ,
κορωνός, ἔργων ἴδρις, οὐδαρ( )

The speaker endows the work-ox with human mental qualities, but negative ones: *κορωνός* suggests a disdainful, haughty creature and *ἴδρις* indicates cunning, knowing in a mischievous way.[5] Who "we" (*ἡμῖν*) indicates is impossible to tell, perhaps some other domestic animals that feel slighted by the arrogance of the work-ox. Fr. 35 seems to be a narrative about animal characters that highlights certain negative traits, thus establishing the appropriate setting for invective against the transgressor. The presentation of the ox here seems to agree with the conventions of animal fables.[6]

---

[2] On fable in archaic Greece, see Lloyd-Jones 1975: 21-22; Lasserre, 1984: 61-96; Van Dijk 1997: 148-9; Adrados 1999; Acosta-Hughes 2002: 170-3.

[3] See Adrados 1999: 244. Nagy 1979: 315 ff. suggests that *αἶνος* is connected with *αισχ* <*αἰσχρός* or *αισυλο*: in *Il.* 20.202, 433 *αἴσυλα* ("unseemly things") is equated with *κερτομίαι,* reproaches. He also notes the association of Aesop with the figure of a dog (*κυνοκέφαλος*), presumably in connection with the traditional use of *κύων* and its derivatives in the language of blame. For the dissociation of *αἶνος* from comic ritual and abuse, see Rankin 1974: 15.

[4] West 1974: 123-4 suggests that *κηρύλος* (*κορώνη*) is a corruption of *πόρνη* and the projecting rock is an allusion to an erect penis.

[5] Cf. the epodic fr. 201 (*πόλλ᾽ οἶδ᾽ ἀλώπηξ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐχῖνος ἓν μέγα*). In Sem. 7.8, the woman who originates from the fox is called "all-knowing" (*πάντων ἴδριν*), but the adjective clearly denotes a liability of character rather than an asset.

[6] So also Lasserre and Bonnard 1958: 11, who approach frr. 34-37 (and also 211 and 231) in the light of the Aesopic fable "The wasps, the partridge, and the peasant." The latter wants to cross the sea but the wasps demand money in order to offer their services. Bowie 2001: 7 and Zanetto 2001: 67 are reluctant to consider the short animal passages as clear indications of the presence of animal fables in the non-epodic material, but see Adrados 1999: 242, who finds traces of fables in Archilochus' stichic iambs: the wasps, the partridges and the farmer (113, 115 Adrados edition); the mule that boasts of his mother (mare) but forgets his father (ass), 232; the watchdog and the vagabond, 238.

Semonides:
Fr. 7 contains ten references to animals from which certain female types descend. The poem has similarities to the Hesiodic version of the origin of woman (*Theog*. 570 ff. and *Op.* 54 ff.), but also reveals influence from fable, namely, the fashioning of women from animals.[7] Even apart from fr. 7, there are twenty-one references to various animals, an unprecedented number among the lyric poets. In some poems animals are used in figurative speech and in others they seem to be mentioned in passing.[8]

There are two fragments, however, in which animals are presented as in fables, that is, as characters in a narrative. In fr. 9 a heron takes an eel away from a hawk:

> ἐρωιδιὸς γὰρ ἔγχελυν Μαιανδρίην
> τρίορχον εὑρὼν ἐσθίοντ᾽ ἀπείλετο.

The fragment starts in *media re* and breaks off abruptly, but one imagines that the hawk, having been deprived of his meal, will react in one way or another: perhaps with some violence, perhaps with some censuring words. The animal characters and an act rich in possibilities for aggressive commentary (punishment, revenge, and so on) strongly suggest an animal fable.[9] Fr. 13 also has the same kind of air: the speaker confesses that a dung beetle (ἑρπετόν) has flown among "us" (ἧμιν); the first words in the fragment introduce the incident in a way (τὸ δ᾽) that indicates that there has been mention of it earlier. Even the fact that the speaker elaborates on its particulars (τὸ ζωίων κάκιστον ἔκτηται βίον) suggests that the ἑρπετόν here is depicted as a character

[7] Cf. Lloyd-Jones 1975: 25; Brown 1997: 73, with reference to Aes. *Fab*. 240 Perry (after the creation of too many animals and lack of sufficient material for men, Prometheus changes some of the former into the latter).

[8] Examples of figurative uses: ὥσπερ ἔγχελυς, 8; οἷον χηνὸς ᾤεον, 11; οὐκ ἄν τις...ἀνὴρ λέοντ᾽ ἔδεισεν οὐδὲ πάρδαλιν, 14; ἵππος ὡς κορωνίτης, 18.

[9] Zanetto 2001: 67 expresses his confidence that the fragment is the *incipit* of an *ainos*; Brown 1997: 74 also takes fr. 9 as part of a fable, noting, however, that the story of a heron being robbed by a raptor of his eel is not transmitted in any ancient collection of fables, with Perry treating the episode as an unattested Aesopic fable. Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 176-7 concede that the fragment may be an αἶνος, but, following Welcker, perhaps not of the Aesopic kind (they are more inclined to take it as referring to a symposiast who got into an argument over a particularly delicious dish).

and that the speaker himself may be an animal. It may belong to the fable of the beetle and the eagle.[10]

Fr.15, too, which survives as four words, each signifying a kind of fish (*θύννοισι τευθίς, κωβιοῖσι κωρίδες*) may also be an animal fable. There is no verb, but since two of the nouns are in the nominative they are the subjects of the sentence; what the cuttlefish and prawns do with the tunas and gudgeons we do not know, although it is certain that there is some interaction among them (if they are not simply delicacies, courses of a meal).[11] There may be other fragments, too, in which animals play an important role (for instance, fr. 28), but the context is missing.[12]

B. *Only in the First Two Generations*

Military References

Archilochus:

Of the four fragments containing military terms, three clearly are not part of a military narrative.[13] The fourth (fr. 18), consisting of only three words (*παῖδ' Ἄρεως μιηφόνου*), alludes to the *Iliad*, in which *μιαιφόνος* (blood-stained) is a frequent epithet of Ares (5.31, 5.455, 5.844, 21.402). It is noteworthy that Eustathius quotes Archilochus' words in the context of *Il.* 5.31, which may indicate that Archilochus shares the military theme of the Homeric passage. It has been suggested[14] that the fragment is abusive and that the poet, parodying Homer,

---

[10] So Zanetto 2001: 67; Diehl understands the lines as part of the fable of the eagle and the dung-beetle (Aes. *Fab.* 3 Perry). West 1984: 112 believes that fr. 13 comes from a scatological narrative. See also Brown 1997: 74.

[11] Edmonds 1931: 227 wonders whether the missing verb is "do not mate." Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 183-4 acknowledge that it is impossible to imagine the situation, although they favor a sympotic context, with a list of diverse courses; cf. also Malusa's suggestion, cited by the latter, that the poet has in mind his enemies against whom he tries to defend himself, as the squid does against the tuna.

[12] Lasserre 1984: 64 notes that statistics are particularly significant for Semonides: two animal fables in a very small corpus may be indicative of their high frequency.

[13] In fr. 23 the military references appear to be marginal (*οὔτοι ποτ' ἄνδρες ἐξεπόρθησαν* and *εἷλες αἰχμῆι,* i.e., *πόλιν ταύτην*, ll. 18-9). For an erotic interpretation of the poem, cf. West 1974: 119; Burnett 1983: 71-5. In fr. 24.13 the reference to *αἰχμηταί* (marines, pirates?) is also made in passing, denoting one of the many dangers merchants regularly meet on the open sea. In fr. 58.7 a military term (*δηΐων*, 58.7) appears among references to song and music, and perhaps obscenity, cf. *ὀφρύκνηστον*, 10). The context may be sympotic.

[14] Lasserre and Bonnard 1958: 19.

is threatening an enemy, but no other reference to Ares is made in jest in Archilochus.[15]

Semonides:
His fragments contain only one reference to Ares (*τοὺς δ᾽ Ἄρει δεδμημένους / πέμπει μελαίνης Ἀΐδης ὑπὸ χθονός*, 1.13). The theme of the lines, however, is not a battle but the powerlessness and fragility of the human condition: war is merely one of the numerous agents that send men to Hades.

Solon:
There is one reference, but the use of weaponry is clearly metaphorical. The poet likens his position between the opposing factions during the turbulent days of the reforms to the edge of a sword (*ἐν μεταιχμίωι*, 37.9).

II. Permanent Thematic Elements

A. *In All Four Poets*

1. *Food/Eating*

Archilochus:
In fr. 48.2 there is a textually uncertain mention of *δαῖτα*, which may signify either meal/banquet or meat/food. The fragment consists of thirty-two incomplete lines and the preserved text indicates that the reference to food in the beginning of the poem is made in passing. It is quite likely that the setting is sympotic, as argued above. In fr. 79, *ἤϊα* (food for travelers) has no context, but the only other partially preserved word *ἴθα*[*γεν* may suggest a narrative in which natives supply provisions to travelers.

---

[15] Of the four references to Ares in Archilochus' poetry, three echo Homer, and, whenever we can tell, they are always serious: in fr. 1 the speaker is both a poet and a servant of Enyalius (*θεράπων Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος*); in fr. 3.2 Ares is mentioned, very appropriately, in a battle scene (*εὖτ᾽ ἂν δὴ μῶλον Ἄρης συνάγῃι*); in the one-line gnomic fr. 110 the god of war is understood as impartial to all men (the possible presence of *Ἐρξίης* in the beginning of the fragment [thus Tarditi] may create another parallel with the military frr. 88 and 89, also addressed to Erxies). Ares may have appeared again in the poem from which the elegiac fr. 6 (*ξείνια δυσμενέσιν λυγρὰ χαριζόμενοι*) derives, cf. schol. Soph. *El.* 96 *ξένια γὰρ Ἄρεως τραύματ᾽* <*ἐστι*> *καὶ φόνοι.*

Semonides:

In fr. 23 the speaker brings cheese from Achaea (*τυρὸς ἐξ Ἀχαΐης Τρομίλιος θαυμαστός*). The setting is indeterminate but the reference to cheese may be isolated.[16] In fr. 24 the speaker is a cook (*μάγειρος*) who brags, showing off his professional skill (*κὼς ⟨ὗν⟩ ἀπεῦσα κὼς ἐμίστυλα κρέα*) and also his knowledge of butchering of meat in a ritually prescribed manner (*ἰρωστί*). Another sacrificial scene appears in fr. 28 (*ὁπλὰς ἐκίνει τῶν ὀπισθίων ποδῶν*), which depicts a protesting piglet. In fr. 30 *μηρίων δεδαυμένων* (roasted thighs) refers to a banquet during either its actual consumption or its preparation. In fr. 32 there is a mention of *ἤϊα*, and in another gloss (38) occurs the word *νήστης*, that is, a person with an empty stomach.[17]

Solon:

Frr. 38-40 (no more than eight lines altogether) probably come from the same poem, as their syntax suggests (use of the third person plural, and of *οἱ μέν/οἱ δέ, ἄλλος/ἕτερος*). The fragments are quite different from the rest of Solon's corpus in that they contain a stunning catalogue of dishes or kinds of food:[18] *ἴτρια, ἄρτον, γούρους, φακοῖσι, πεμμάτων*, 38; *ἴγδιν, σίλφιον, ὄξος*, 39; *κόκκωνας, σήσαμα*, 40.[19] The subject of the verb *τρώγουσι* (38.1) remains obscure, as does the theme of the fragments. Noussia,[20] in a detailed discussion, suggests that all items mentioned by Solon are typical of the complex *δεῖπνον-συμπόσιον* (*-κῶμος*) and are often mentioned as *τραγήματα* (*ἐπιδορπίσματα, ἐπιφορήματα*). The delicacies (cakes, sweets, eggs,

---

[16] Bowie's 2001: 9 suggestion for the development of the scene (an account of the speaker's visit to Achaea) seems to be more plausible than that of Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 195-6, who think that the fragment is part of a description of a table with courses and dishes, the speaker bringing his contribution (*ἔρανος* or *συμβολή*).

[17] There is also a number of other fragments in which animals susceptible to becoming food occur, but their function is uncertain: *ἀμπέχοντες σπλάγχνα* (12), textually problematic, may again refer to preparation of a banquet. Fr. 9 does contain a delicacy (Maeandrian eel), but the lines probably come from a fable. Fr. 15 (*θύνοισι τευθίς, κωβιοῖσι κωρίδες*) may be a simile, but there is no way of knowing; cf. Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 183-4 (with reference to Romagnoli), who take it as coming from a list of diverse courses, as in comedy.

[18] See also *ῥοῦν* in fr. 41 (placed by West under *Varia*). In fr. 37.8 there is a figurative reference to milk, in the sense that anyone else in Solon's position would have taken advantage of his power (*δῆμον οὐδ' ἐπαύετο / πρὶν ἀνταράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα*).

[19] For a food repertory of early and classical Greece, see Dalby 1996: 57 ff.

[20] Noussia 2001: 353-9. For a similar discussion with ample commentary on each food item, see also Maehler, Noussia, and Fantuzzi 2001: 368-74.

nuts, fresh and dried fruit, small portions of meat) were served at the *δεύτεραι τράπεζαι*, the after-dinner phase, which included wine-drinking and desserts.[21]

Hipponax:

In fr. 39 the speaker makes a dramatic plea to a god to save him from starvation, and elsewhere the characters are depicted eating, with mention of the specific dishes they are consuming (frr. 75, 78). The emphasis on food is reflected in the extensive variety of terms for "eat:" *ἐσθίουσι*, 8; *δαινύμενος, κατέφαγε, τρώγων*, 26; *καταβρύκων, φαρμάσσων, ἐμβάπτων*, 26a; *δειπνήσας, ἐδέψατ'*, 78; *περιτρώγων*, 86. Likewise, in no fewer than ten fragments there are references to numerous kinds of food: *ἰσχάδας τε καὶ μᾶζαν καὶ τυρόν*, 8; *ἄρτον*, 12; *θύνναν, μυσσωτόν, σῦκα, κρίθινον κόλλικα, χόρτον*, 26; *ἀτταγέας, λαγούς, τηγανίτας σησάμοισι, ἀττανίτας κηρίοισιν*, 26a; *κύθρος ἔτνεος*, 29a; *κριθέων, ἀλφίτων κυκεῶνα*,[22] 39; *λέκος πυροῦ*, 58; *κωλῆν* (?) *ψωμόν*, 75; *συκάμινα, κιμαίωι*, 78; *κράμβην*, 104; *κρέας ἐκ συός*, 114b. We also find the adjective *πασπαληφάγον* ("meal-fed"), 103, and the innovative *μεσσηγυδορποχέστης*, 114c ("one who goes to the bathroom during the meal" so that after each evacuation he has space for more food).

In addition to the dishes his characters consume or wish to consume, Hipponax also mentions food-producing trees and plants: in fr. 48 we read *συκῆν μέλαιναν, ἀμπέλου κασιγνήτην*. *συκῆ* frequently has obscene connotations (cf. *καὶ νῦν ἀρειᾶι σύκινόν με ποιῆσαι*, 41),[23] but here its description as sister of the vine as well as the suggestion of the particularly inviting black figs indicates that the fig-tree is understood as a source of food.[24]

---

[21] For other interpretations, see West 1974: 32 and Podlecki 1984: 137 (welfare of the Athenian people after the liberation from *seisachtheia*); Masaracchia 1958: 360 (curious custom witnessed by Solon during his trips, frr. 38-40 being part of an ethnographic *excursus*); Hartung and Hammer, cited by Noussia, 2001: 359 (a satire against the gluttony of the rich); Ceccareli 1996: 116 (reference to a utopian land where everything is abundant).

[22] For a discussion of *κυκεών* with emphasis on its ritual nuances, see Rosen 1987: 416-8.

[23] On the sexual connotations of *συκῆ*, cf. Henderson 1975: 22, 118.

[24] On two occasions, food or cooking utensils are used figuratively: in a textually problematic line the speaker predicts, in an obviously abusive context, that Bupalus' bread will be "of bad reputation" (*δυσώνυμον ἄρτον*, 12.3), and in fr. 29a the gurgling of one's stomach is likened to the sound of boiling soup (*κύθρος ἔτνεος*).

2. *Wine Drinking*

Archilochus:

In fr. 49.2 the incomplete *πινε*[is certainly the remnant of a form of *πίνω*, but the context is poorly preserved, and what survives is an abusive address with no further allusions to drinking. In the similarly mutilated fr. 58.12, it appears that the speaker is singing to the accompaniment of the *aulos* (*ἄιδων ὑπ᾽ αὐλητῆρος*). The expression is almost identical to that of *Thgn.* 533 and 1065, both of which references are sympotic. If Theognis is imitating Archilochus, as is possible, fr. 58 may also be sympotic.[25]

Semonides:

There are no direct references to wine drinking, although some fragments clearly suggest it. In fr. 26 someone takes the drinking cups (*ποτήρια*) from the table, and in fr. 27 there is a mention of an *Ἀργείη κύλιξ*, but again without context.[26]

Solon:

The first word in fr. 36, followed by a long list of different kinds of food, is *πίνουσι*. For its connection to the after-dinner phase, see Noussia's suggestion above (*Food/Eating*).

Hipponax:

Frr. 13 and 14 seem to come from the same poem and to depict Arete and her companion (Bupalus?) drinking. There is no *κύλιξ* available, because the slave has broken it and Arete cannot afford another, with the result that she and her companion are forced to drink from a milking pot (*πελλίς*). In fr. 67 the speaker states that those who have drunk

[25] There is an additional reference to drinking in fr. 42 (*αὐλῶι βρῦτον...ἔμυζε*) but it occurs in a simile.

[26] Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 185, 188 make additional suggestions: fr. 16 mentions *bakkaris*, which was used as a remedy against drunkenness, according to Athenaeus; fr. 18 is part of a poem in which the speaker addresses sarcastically an effeminate symposiast or a *παῖς* participating in a *κῶμος*. But these are conjectures with varying degrees of probability; *βακκάρι* (regular meaning: unguent) in fr. 16, for instance, is unlikely to have the connotations the commentators suggest because it is expressed paratactically with *μύροισι καὶ θυώμασιν*; moreover, there is an explanatory clause (*καὶ γάρ τις ἔμπορος παρῆν*) which connects all of them with the presence of a merchant, not drunkenness. Fr. 25 mentions sympotic paraphernalia, *ἀρυστῆρα τρυγός* (*ἀρυστήρ = κύαθος*, a ladle for drawing wine out of the *κρατήρ*), but the sentence is in the negative and probably used figuratively: in "no one gave me even a cup of wine dregs," "wine dregs" may simply stand for "anything of little value."

strong wine have lost their wits (*ὀλίγα φρονέουσι οἱ χάλιν πεπωκότες*).[27]

3. *Invective*

Archilochus:

The abuse centers on certain aspects such as physical appearance, sexuality, social background, drunkenness and gluttony. The means of delivery are frontal verbal assault in the form of address; presentation of the enemy in sexual situations; animal fable, with its chastising tone; and prayer for the destruction of a foe. Archilochus' mastery of these methods of invective must have been devastatingly effective, if we are to judge from the persistent tradition throughout antiquity about the deaths of Lycambes and his daughters and his reputation as a pungent and wrathful poet.[28]

Lycambes appears in all iambic genres as a target of abuse. Although we know from the tetrameters and the epodes that he is treated with contempt and disdain, in the trimeters the relevant fragments are so severed from context that they do not provide such a vivid view. In fr. 60 the speaker describes him sarcastically as *τρισμακάριος* for having such children, and in fr. 54, he combines abuse and sexual language: the reference to possible penetration of one of his daughters (*π[ει]ρήσεται*, 6) must have been meant both to humiliate and discredit Lycambes, who is the addressee. In fr. 38 there is a degradation of Neoboule (who we know is the oldest daughter of Lycambes), when the speaker refers to her younger sister as *ὑπερτέραν*, meaning, according to the Homeric scholiast, "superior."[29]

---

[27] *χάλις*, as Masson 1962: 139-40 notes, is probably a dialectic, vulgar or even foreign term meaning "pure, undiluted wine." Archilochus uses the expression *χαλίκρητον μέθυ* in an abusive trochaic fragment (124b.1).

[28] Cf. for instance, Eust. in Hom. *Od.* 11.277 (1684.45): *ἦν γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ δεινὸς ὑβρίζειν· ὅθεν καὶ παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν οὕτω σκώπτειν εὐφυῶν τό, Ἀρχίλοχον πεπάτηκας, ὡς εἴ τις εἴπῃ, σκορπίον ἢ ὄφιν ἢ κακὴν ἄκανθαν.* Archilochus himself mentions in his poetry *ἓν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα, / τὸν κακῶς ⟨μ'⟩ ἔρδοντα δεινοῖς ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς* (126); *μάχης δὲ τῆς σῆς, ὥστε διψέων πιεῖν, / ὡς ἐρέω* (125).

[29] Elsewhere (fr. 188) Neoboule is described as a woman who has lost both the softness of her skin and her procreative ability, see the discussion of Slings 1995: 1-2; Brown 1995: 29-34. Also Bowie 1987: 15-21. For further derogatory remarks see the Cologne Epode (196a). West 1994: 2 takes frr. 36-7 as referring to the willing participation of the Lycambidae in sexual activities, described in graphic detail, and frr. 39 and 45 as suggesting the presence of several males. The circumstances,

In fr. 26 the speaker prays to Apollo for the destruction of some enemies; the hostility is presented not in personal terms but rather as communal. The request *τοὺς μὲν αἰτίους πήμαινε / ὄλλυε* and *ἡμέας δὲ* in two successive lines shows an intense opposition between "them" and "us," in a manner similar to that of Alc. 70 P. In fr. 49.7 the addressee of the poem is called "thief of the night" (*φιλῆτα νύκτωρ*), either in connection with his nightly visits to the woman of l. 4 or in the context of a more generalized attack against his character (cf. *ἔχθιστε*, 5). In fr. 43 the speaker's target is ridiculed on account of the large size of his penis, diminished to the level of bestiality through the simile used (*ὥστ' ὄνου Πριηνέως*). In fr. 25 Melesander is mocked for his homosexuality; despite the matter-of-factness of the line, the choice of a term with inelegant sexual connotations (*σάθη*) elsewhere used in abusive context (fr. 43) indicates that this statement, neutral on the surface, conceals invective and disapproval. Fr. 29, with its addressee Arthmiades (?) called *θαυμαστός*, seems to be sarcastic, as is certainly fr. 82, which, in addition, focuses again on homosexuality, cf. *σάθη*, 4. The work-ox (*βοῦς*) in fr. 35 and the kingfisher (*κηρύλος*) in fr. 41, probably by means of fables, represent individuals who are also the targets of abuse.

Semonides:
Fr. 7, the longest surviving fragment of archaic non-epic poetry, is a treatise that examines the different types of women and attempts to illuminate them through descent from certain animals that display similar traits. The views of the poem are quite unflattering: of the ten types of women presented, nine are clear liabilities and only one (that which originates in the bee) is good and worthy. Whether intended as a serious classification of types of women or not, the poem contains abusive language that seems to go beyond entertaining satire.[30] Each type of woman is distinguished by certain evils, the particular negative characteristics of the animal she descends from: the woman who originates from the sow (2-6) is filthy (*ἀν' οἶκον βορβόρωι; ἄλουτος,*

---

however, remain obscure. In frr. 207-8 Neoboule is called *δῆμος* and *ἐργάτις*, terms used for prostitutes.

[30] Lloyd-Jones 1975: 23 ff. sees the poem as satire, albeit not of an individual but of an entire sex. Also Schear 1984: 40, who takes the poem as entertainment, specifically as an expansion of the popular game of *eikasmos*, an ancient pastime. But see Stehle's 1997: 237n.96 protestation regarding lack of an analysis of the assumptions out of which the humor arises.

ἀπλύτοισ᾽ ἐν εἵμασιν, ἐν κοπρίῃσιν), sloppy (*ἄκοσμα κεῖται*), lazy (*ἡμένη*) and gluttonous (*πιαίνεται*). The woman descended from the fox (7-11) is cunning (*πάντων ἴδριν*) and mean (*ὀργὴν...ἔχει*); the one coming from the dog is wicked (*λιτοργόν*) and shamelessly eager to know other people's private affairs (12-20); the woman with the ass as ancestor is lascivious (*πρὸς ἔργον ἀφροδίσιον*) and intolerant (*μόγις ἔστερξεν*);[31] the ape-woman (71-82) is ugly (*αἴσχιστα μὲν πρόσωπα; ἐπ᾽ αὐχένα βραχεῖα; ἄπυγος, αὐτόκωλος*), malicious (*ὅκως τι...ἔρξειεν κακόν*), oblivious to her condemnation by the community (*οὐδέ οἱ γέλως μέλει*) and the laughingstock of all (*πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις γέλως*); and so forth. The only woman who is good is the one descended from the bee, yet the last section of the poem proclaims that even she who appears to be good is in fact an evil to her husband (97-8), thus offering a reinterpretation of the earlier passage. The reference to Helen at the end is an allusion to woman's dangerous allure, which may cause only disasters.[32] The fragment ends with the conclusion that, all things taken into consideration, woman is a huge liability and an evil for man (*Ζεὺς γὰρ μέγιστον τοῦτ᾽ ἐποίησεν κακόν*, 115).

Apart from fr. 7, all sexual fragments as well as those which may be animal fables should be considered abusive. In fr. 10a the addressee is chastised for his untidy and dirty appearance, but the context is obscure.[33] Fr. 14 refers to someone's lack of courage. "Excessive fear is described with hyperbole, aimed at making the mockery more biting, especially since the language is reminiscent of *epos*, cf. *Il.* 17.20."[34]

Solon:

In fr. 36 Solon defends his political reforms and responds to the complaints of his opponents. *Palatine Anthology* (12.4) and Plutarch (*Sol.* 15.5-6) associate the poem with *seisachtheia* and the problem of debt-slavery in Athens, and indeed a number of references to the enslavement of the earth, the removal of landmarks, and the sale of

---

[31] See also Horden 2002: 39-40, who suggests that the ass-woman's (7.43-9) stubbornness and tendency to the excessive consumption of food and men is similar to the proverb "ass that eats its own bedding."

[32] Cf. Stehle 1997: 239; Worman 2002: 85.

[33] Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 178-9 speculate that perhaps the speaker reprimands someone who refuses to wash as a sign of excessive mourning; or perhaps someone who came to the symposium unwashed, thus violating the sympotic norms.

[34] *Ibid*, 182.

Athenians into foreign and domestic slavery lend support to this connection.[35] In fr. 37 Solon upbraids both the masses and the men of power for their complaints and asserts that they should be grateful to him, for any other person in his position would have abused his power for his personal benefit. The poems are written in stern, confrontational language, indicating that Solon considered the trimeters (and iambic meters generally) as a proper genre for attack and censure; cf. *δήμῳ μὲν εἰ χρὴ διαφάδην ὀνειδίσαι* (37.1). The fact that Solon's iambus does not display the vituperative qualities of the invectives of Archilochus or Hipponax may perhaps be understood by the self-imposed restraint of a public figure who is addressing issues of public policy.[36] In the last line of fr. 36, Solon uses the simile of a wolf among many hounds (*ὡς ἐν κυσὶν πολλῇσιν ἐστράφην λύκος*, 27) to underline his resolution in addressing the problems of Athens, regardless of personal cost. While the wolf traditionally represents the outsider, an isolated figure cut off from the workings of society, Solon reverses the pattern, but always within the context of praise-blame poetry.[37]

Hipponax:
Vilification is very common, with several individuals suffering as personal targets, chief among them Bupalus. In fr. 1 the speaker denounces him publicly as a murderer (*ὦ Κλαζομένιοι, Βούπαλος κατέκτεινεν*), thus exposing him to both isolation from and punishment by the community. Fr. 95a again presents Bupalus in opposition to the society: *ὡς οἱ μὲν ἀγεῖ Βουπάλωι κατηρῶντο.* Tzetzes tells us that *ἀγής* here has the sense of *μυσαρός* (foul, dirty), the idea being that the accused person represents a form of pollution. In fr. 12 Bupalus is accused of incest (*μητροκοίτης*), a transgression which dis-

[35] For a recent discussion, see Almeida 2003: 222n.15.

[36] Cf. Campbell 1967: 233; Blaise 1995: 26. In fact, the trochaic tetrameter fr. 33 is a direct speech of one of Solon's opponents, but the outcome hardly discredits the poet. His foe displays such ineptitude, greed and degradation that his words become a self-indictment. Solon makes his opponent self-destruct.

[37] Anhalt 1993: 134: "Solon's simile recognizes the efficacy of a symbolic wolf, a kind of *pharmakos* for the promotion of social cohesion, and gives the tradition a twist, for the poet takes the role upon himself. He transposes the wolf symbol into the hero necessary for the preservation of his society." The imagery of the wolf as an outsider may well have been utilized first by Archilochus: Lycambes' name has been interpreted by Picard-Cambridge 1927: 15 as "having the steps of a wolf;" for the Indo-European motif of the wolf as a figure outside of society, cf. Nagy 1979: 242.

graces him (his bread has a "bad name," δυσώνυμον ἄρτον, 3) and perhaps the same character has intercourse with his own mother while she is sleeping, thus provoking the enmity of the gods (τὸν θεοῖσιν ἐχθρὸν τοῦτον) in fr. 70. Bupalus and every other similar transgressor must undergo the ritual of καθαρμός, during which the φαρμακός is exposed to a series of rites and punishments by which the city reclaims its purity. In no fewer than eight fragments (5-10, 92, 104) the speaker announces that his enemy deserves such treatment, with the aspect of physical punishment particularly emphasized.

Incompetence and foolishness are castigated: in fr. 28 Mimnes is an artist who makes the mistake of painting a serpent on a ship the wrong way round, thus becoming the target of abuse, not only on the grounds of his artistic failure[38] but also, quite unexpectedly, of his homosexuality (see the hyperbolic κατωμόχανος, that is, a person "so debauched that his rear end gapes all the way to his shoulders"[39]). In frr. 4 and 4a the target is Cicon, presented in his professional aspect as a priest and soothsayer, but of very poor caliber. In fr. 26 another man who has wasted a substantial amount of money from his inheritance is reproached for his improvidence and pronounced to be deserving of his current hard life and of a slave's fate. In a twist similar to that of fr. 28, the poem delivers a sting about the man's sexuality: he is likened to a eunuch from Lampsacus.[40]

In Hipponax, too, graphically explicit scenes, in addition to their other intentions, be they sexual humor or voyeurism, probably contain an element of invective directed toward other men and also the

---

[38] Hughes' 1996: 212 and Acosta-Hughes' 2002: 32-5 observation that the abuse of the poet is directed, among others, against Bupalus, Athenis and Mimnes, all of whom are artists, and that he censures them for something each one has done in an aesthetically wrong or displeasing manner, is, on the basis of the extant corpus, only partially correct. Quite probably in some of the lost poems Bupalus was depicted as an incompetent sculptor, but in the fragments we possess he always appears as the competitor of the poet in non-artistic matters. Cf. also Bowie 2001: 10, who notes that the charge brought against Bupalus by the opening of the first iambus is not one of creating an offensive sculpture but the more serious charge of homicide. For the treatment of Bupalus as a *pharmakos*, a social scourge, see Rosen 1988b: 21.

[39] Henderson 1975: 22.

[40] Lévêque 1997: 21 thinks that the reference to an εὐνοῦχος occurs perhaps because he is thought to eat the most precious things, in compensation for other lost pleasures. Lampsacus is mentioned either because the reputation of its citizens regarding their virility was not very flattering or because there was a cult of Priapus there.

speaker's female partners.[41] The females in Hipponax are portrayed as sluttish and low, since, like their male counterparts, they are part of a raunchy and backstabbing world.

4. *Serious Reflection*

Archilochus:
Priorities in life. Fr. 19 comes from a direct speech by Charon the carpenter, but had Aristotle not told us so we would have thought that the poet speaks in the guise of an impersonal gnomic "I." The lines have a meditative flavor, since the speaker makes a judgment on what is truly important in life and, contradicting the popular view, deems material wealth and power to be negative qualities.[42]

Civil strife/war. Fr. 20 survives as one line: *κλαίω τὰ Θασίων, οὐ τὰ Μαγνήτων κακά*. The exact reference is not clear, but the fact that the speaker classifies the misfortunes of the Thasians together with those of the Magnesians (in fact judging them to be more serious) suggests some parallels: the Magnesians, for a long time a prosperous people, were subdued by the Ephesians. It may be that by this comparison the poet envokes some unlucky war of the Thasians[43] or a civil strife on the island (cf. allusions in the trochaic frr. 91 and 102). In such context, contemplation on the contrast between prosperity on the one hand and subsequent slavery or public discord on the other was probably an important element of the poem.

Nature of Pleasure. The theme of fr. 25 is the individuality of pleasure and one's inability to satisfy everybody's needs in a uniform way. Despite the poor condition of the fragment, a rudimentary reconstruction of the thread of thought seems possible. The poem starts with the general statement (Latte's restoration):

> *οὐκ ἔστι πως ἁπλῆ]τις ἀνθρώπων φυή,*
> *ἀλλ' ἄλλος ἄλλωι καρδίην ἰαίνεται.*

The speaker then proceeds with the (self-proclaimed) authority of a *μάντις* who is ordained by Zeus (6) by giving some examples of men

[41] Cf. Stehle 1997: 257, who remarks that if in fr. 84.10-22 the woman is Arete, elsewhere portrayed as the girlfriend of Bupalus, then the speaker shames him in imagination both by replacing him in her bed and by exposing her to the view of the whole group.

[42] See also Brown 1997: 72n.12.

[43] Perhaps against the Thracians, see Gerber 1970: 19.

with different tastes. The fragment is quoted by the scholiast on *Od.* 14.228, but the presence of *σάθη* (3) is problematic and may suggest that the poem after all develops into invective.[44]

Semonides:
Helplessness of human condition. In fr. 1 the speaker declares that humans are merely pawns in the hands of the gods, harboring great hopes but unable to see that the future brings only old age and death. The poem has strong similarities with Hesiodic thought and early elegy in general.[45] Fr. 4 expresses a similar sentiment, that is, man's proneness to make mistakes and his inability to escape fate (*πάμπαν δ' ἄμωμος οὔ τις οὐδ' ἀκήριος*, fr. 4). In fr. 42 it is stated that the gods easily deceive men.

Nature of woman. Fr. 7 is a long list of the various types of women, according to the animals from which they originate (7.1-93). Females are understood as an evil, having a negative impact on their husbands' lives and on society in general (7.94-118; also fr. 6). Despite its vituperation and comic/entertaining qualities, the underlined principle of fr. 7 seems to be a serious effort to understand female behavior through proper classification.[46]

Old age. Contemplation on the sober realities of advanced age appears in fr. 1.11-2. Men often reach this undesired stage of life (*γῆρας ἄζηλον*) without having achieved their goals.

Carpe diem. Mortals die as victims of illness, at the battlefield, or at sea, even by their own hand (fr. 1.12-19). Although death is omnipresent, men should not concentrate on it while they live (fr. 2), for death lasts for ever while life is short (fr. 3).[47]

Acquisition of virtue. Fr. 5 survives as an incomplete line (*ἄθηλος ἵππωι πῶλος ὣς ἅμα τρέχ-*), but the various testimonia provide us

---

[44] See Brown 1997: 72n.12; Bowie 2001: 16.

[45] The fragment's parallels with elegy are reinforced by the address *ὦ παῖ.* For Hesiodic influences, see Frankel 1975: 202n.2. Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 156 ff. acknowledge the passage as an important indication that the iambic form was as flexible as the elegiac couplet and that it anticipated the political trimeters of Solon. On the differences in thought between the latter and Semonides, see Anhalt 1993: 40.

[46] Cf. Fränkel 1975: 205-6. See also Pomeroy 1975: 49, who describes Semonides as a "poet-philosopher." Bowie 2001: 7 considers fr. 7 "a type of reflective analysis that might well be found in elegy were it not for its prominent elements of generalized *psogoi.*"

[47] Cf. also Wilamowitz 1913: 273; Gerber 1970: 56. For a more pessimistic interpretation of fr. 1, see Carson 1984: 59-71.

with some context: the poet uses equine imagery to discuss the necessity of healthy training and education: just as the suckling foal runs beside his mother, learning her ways, so humans should keep company with good men if their goal is self-improvement.

Solon:
Socio-political order. In the trimeters as in his other genres, Solon focuses on issues of public importance, on events that affect the welfare of Athenian society. The characters here are not individuals but entire social classes interacting with each other. The particular range of themes is closely connected with the important reforms of Athenian society at the beginning of the sixth century. Solon, the consummate public figure, uses his poetry as a political weapon both to defend himself and to censure his opponents. Frr. 36 and 37 have an intense personal color, but they also contain a number of implicit observations about the qualities of true leaders and the principles that lie behind the stability and prosperity of a nation.

Hipponax:
In fr. 67 the speaker claims that those who drink strong wine cannot think straight (*ὀλίγα φρονέουσιν οἱ χάλιν πεπωκότες*). The fragment has the typological characteristics of a general aphorism (impersonal subject, verb in the present indicative). One wonders whether fr. 67 comes from a poem in which the poet contemplates drinking in the abstract or is simply an isolated statement selected from a poem that describes a certain episode, as do the majority of the poems of Hipponax. The fragment is too short to be conclusive, but its vilificatory tone is similar to that of the abusive poems.[48] The reference to women in fr. 68 is also of similar mold (impersonal subject, verb in the present indicative): *δύ' ἡμέραι γυναικός εἰσιν ἥδισται, / ὅταν γαμῆι τις κἀκφέρῃι τεθνηκυῖαν*. The fragment is attributed to Hipponax by Stobaeus (*περὶ γάμου*, 4.22-35) but its authenticity has been questioned on good grounds.[49]

---

[48] The line of fr. 67 may well be an aside: the speaker, in the course of reviling a drunk, digresses momentarily and expresses a more general *ψόγος*. We should note, for instance, that in frr. 13 and 14 both Arete and her companion (Bupalus?) are depicted drinking.

[49] Cf. the traces of the author's name *[...]λυ[..]ς* in the lemma of *P. Berol.* 9773. For the difficulties of the reading, see Knox 1923: 6 ff. The fragment has an air of a *sententia* by Menander or some other author of New Comedy. Among the doubters

5. *Narrative*

E. Bowie in a recent important article[50] has argued that narrative ("the telling of something that has happened, however brief that happening and however simple the telling"[51]) is very prominent in iambus, especially if compared with other types of short poetry. Indeed narratives thus defined appear in all four iambic poets. Without reiterating Bowie in detail, let us mention in brief the fragments that seem to be part of such poems (classification not always coinciding with that of Bowie).

Archilochus:
Exchange between two interlocutors in an exotic setting, 23; reference to past behavior of a female or females, 30, 47; reference to a particular person (31) or object (37) with connectives (*ἡ δέ, γάρ*) indicating narratives; address suggesting a dialogue in a narrative, 34, 67, 82; animal fable, 35, 41; recounting of sexual encounters, 36, 41-5.[52]

Semonides:
Animal fable, 9, 13; reference to an episode or particular deed suggestive of a more extensive narrative, 12, 14, 16, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28; description of a sexual encounter, 17; address suggesting a dialogue in a narrative, 22 (fr. 23 probably comes from the same poem).

Solon:
Fr. 36 is a report of Solon's achievements through his social reforms, thus forming a type of narrative, expressed in the past tense.

Hipponax:
The corpus of the poet is replete with fragments which either clearly or very likely come from narratives. Even with a conservative count of references to deeds suggestive of longer narrative passages, it yields quite a number of fragments: 3, 13, 14, 16, 20, 29a, 37, 41, 50, 59, 60,

are Diehl, Schubart, Wilamowitz, Campbell; *contra* Bergk, Masson, Gerber, West, Degani.

50 Bowie 2001: 1-27.

51 *Ibid*, 7.

52 Bowie takes a number of fragments expressed in the present tense as potentially narrative, among them frr. 19 (Charon's pronouncements about wealth and power), 20 (expression of sympathy towards the Thasians), and 25 (nature of pleasure). The stance of these poems, as in the majority of cases, remains unclear, but to this author they seem to be contemplative, as stated in the previous section.

61, 63, 72, 73, 77, 78, 79, 95, 95a, 102, 103. Addresses indicating narrative: 15, 25, 42, 44, 47, 52. Sexual encounters: 17, 21, 84, 92, 104.

B. *In Three Poets*

1. *Sexual Themes*

Archilochus:

Sexual scenes may have been fairly frequent. Fr. 42 is a graphic portrayal of fellatio:

> *ὥσπερ αὐλῶι βρῦτον ἢ Θρέϊξ*
> *ἢ Φρὺξ ἔμυζε· κύβδα δ' ἦν πονεομένη.*

Most scholars follow Wilamowitz's emendation *ἔμυζε* ("drink with closed lips") for *ἔβρυζε* (dubious meaning). Burnett translates suggestively: "Like some Phrygian or Thracian sucking beer through a straw, she bent and drank him off."[53] A more literal translation for *κύβδα δ' ἦν πονεομένη* might be "she was bent over, working hard," which brings to mind the association of prostitutes with "work;" cf. *ἐργάτις* = working girl (208).[54] *κύβδα* certainly indicates *σχῆμα συνουσίας*.[55] In fr. 43 the speaker ridicules the large penis of an enemy at the moment of ejaculation, comparing it to that of a Prienian donkey.[56] The connective *ἡ δέ* (*οἱ σάθη*) at the beginning of the fragment indicates that the extant lines are part of a longer description of a sexual encounter. In fr. 39 Athenaeus (122b) tells us that Archilochus has passages that are obscene (*πονηρῶς εἰρημένα*), one of which contains the verb *ἀποσκολύπτω* (draw back the prepuce in coitus). Perhaps fr. 36, in which the lovers (?) have leaned toward a shaded wall (*πρὸς τοῖχον ἐκλίνθησαν ἐν παλινσκίωι*), is sexual as well.[57] Fr. 45 also seems to describe a sexual activity (*κύψαντες ὕβριν ἀθρόην ἀπέφλυσαν,* "bent,

[53] Burnett 1983: 78; Gerber 1976: 7-14. See also West 1994: 2, who thinks that the fragment reveals strong similarities to the material of Mesopotamian baked clay plaques that go "beyond the casual and fortuitous." For a less erotic understanding of the lines, see Edmonds 1931: 115; Lattimore 1944: 172-5.

[54] For relevant vocabulary, see Kurke 1999: 182.

[55] Rankin 1975: 330.

[56] For the association of the ass with intense sexual desire, usually male, in Greek (and Latin) literature, see Hordern 2002: 39.

[57] West 1994: 3 takes frr. 36 and 37 as belonging together and understands them as referring to the lascivious behavior of the daughters of Lycambes by the wall of the temple of Hera.

they sputtered out their licentiousness"), but again the circumstances are obscure. Fr. 66, consisting of the words *μηρῶν μεταξύ*, according to the quoting source refers to *φῦμα* (knob), signifying the male organ.[58] Fr. 40 is clearly sexual (*παρδακὸν δ' ἐπείσιον*, "wet pubis"), and so is fr. 46, which refers to ejaculation in terminology borrowed from a plumber's world (*διὲξ σωλῆνος εἰς ἄγγος*). Fr. 41 has the air of a fable (a kingfisher flapping its wings on a projecting rock), but the extant line is also sexual. Fr. 54 is in poor condition, but the possible reference to penetration, presence of *παρθένοι*, and the address to Lycambes suggest that the fragment draws its abusive force from an allusion to a sexual encounter that is probably contained in a threat (cf. the future tense *π[ει]ρήσεται*).[59] Fr. 44, mentioning foam around the mouth, may also be sexual (*πολλὸς δ' ἀφρὸς ἦν περὶ στόμα*).

Women of the trade must have appeared frequently: in fr. 31 the female is a hetaera, as the quoting source informs us (*ἐν ἑταίρας σώματι*), and the same applies to the one who rejoices in holding *θαλλὸν μυρσίνης* and *ῥοδῆς ἄνθος*, both of which are common slang terms with sexual overtones (fr. 30).[60] The females of fr. 48 may be mentioned extensively if we are to infer from the fact that feminine grammatical forms and objects associated with females appear over a span of twenty lines (*ἐσμυρισμένας*, 5; *πᾶσαι*, 22; *ἀκάτια* = women's shoes, 25[61]). The mention of *τροφός* (madame?) leaves open also the possility of a brothel.[62] Lasserre[63] restores l. 3 to *ἑταίρα* and l.8 (*αι*[.]. ῾*σσ*.[) to *αἱ* [*δ'*] *ὑσσά*[*κ*- (*ὕσσακοι* = vaginas). In fr. 49 a female appears again (*γυνή*, l. 4) but the text is in poor condition and permits no confident conjecture about the possible relationship between her and the man of l. 7. But *πινε*[in l. 2 and the reference to nocturnal activities may also suggest a prostitute or hetaera.

In addition to the fragments above, there are two others that are more enigmatic, in the sense that isolated sexual language appears in a non-sexual context. In fr. 25 the reference to the male organ appears as an *exemplum* of the generalization that each man is pleased in his own way (cf. West's suggestion for the restoration of ll. 3-4 [*δοκεῖ δ'*

---

58 Henderson 1975: 21.

59 Cf. Gerber 1999: 123.

60 *Ibid*, 134-5.

61 Rankin 1975: 330-1 suggests that *ἀκάτια* may also indicate a sexual position of the feet, as it does in Ar. *Lys.* 239.

62 Rankin 1977a: 67; Bowie 2001: 14.

63 Lasserre and Bonnard 1958: 14.

ἄριστ]ον τ[ῶ]ι Μελησά[νδρω]ι σάθην / [εἶναι τράμις δ]ὲ Φα-λ[αγγ]ίωι). If this reconstruction as a statement of generalities is correct,[64] the mention of penis in l. 3 is rather peripheral, a short attack on the homosexual inclinations of a foe.[65] Similar abruptness occurs also in the mutilated fr. 82, which is an address, perhaps to a man whose name ends in *-θενειάδης* (11). There are a number of verbs in the extant text (*ἤρκεσας*, 7; *ἀρκέσειν*, 8; *ἐλάγχανες*, 9; *ἐκάλλυνας*, 12; *φρονεῖς*, 13), but none of them comes from the erotic vocabulary. The presence of *σάθη* (4), however, suggests an attack against the addressee, and the language of the poem is most likely sarcastic.

Semonides:

In fr. 16 the speaker is probably a prostitute,[66] saying that she anointed herself with perfumes "because some merchant was present" (*καὶ γάρ τις ἔμπορος παρῆν*). That the circumstances of the encounter are a symposium is made unlikely by the fact that, while the anointing with perfumes is a well attested sympotic custom, here the use of perfumes is presented as something rather unplanned: it is either the gift of the merchant or a gesture to attract him sexually.[67] A brothel in the port would not have been an unlikely place for such an encounter. The fact that, according to Clement, the poet should blush or be ashamed for saying these things suggests that the nature of interaction between the speaker and the merchant must have had a strong sexual color. Fr. 17 is textually problematic, but it appears to depict anal intercourse (*καὶ τῆς ὄπισθεν †ὀρσοθύρης ἠλσάμην*). The verb *ἠλσάμην* < *εἴλω* indi-

---

[64] Lasserre and Bonnard 1958: 13 think that the topic of the poem is poetic inspiration: like the other early poets, Archilochus derives his authority from Zeus. West 1974: 122 raises the possibility that Archilochus refers to the different tastes of men in order to explain his father's love for a slave-girl Enipo, if l. 6 begins with the words *τὸν πατέρα* (for which there seems to be no clear evidence). E. Lobel in his *editio princeps* (*P. Oxy.* 2310 fr. 1) offers no suggestions.

[65] According to Eusebius (fr. 294), Archilochus expressed deep contempt toward homosexuals (*ἅψασθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν κιναίδων, ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἄλλων πονηρῶν πολὺ πονηρότεροί εἰσιν*); cf. Anacr. 7: *κεῖνος οὐκ ἔγημεν ἀλλ' ἐγήματο.* On abusive references to enemies' lack of manhood, see Stehle 1997: 229.

[66] West 1974: 28. Clement, who quotes the lines, seems to assume that the speaker is the poet himself (*Σιμωνίδης δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἰάμβοις οὐκ αἰδεῖται λέγων*).

[67] Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 184-5 think (following Welcker) that the lines may refer to a hetaera who tries to seduce one of the symposiasts; or even to the poet himself, who confesses to his pouring an excessive amount of perfume on himself so that he became ridiculous.

cates sexual penetration, and Henderson[68] seems right in taking *ὀρσοθύρη* as equivalent to *ὀρθοθύρη* and *pace* Ar. *Eccl.* 316, understanding it as anus. In fr. 7.76 the ape-woman is described as *ἄπυγος*, literally "assless" but having the connotation of lecherous.[69] A sexual pun appears also in fr. 9.2, in which a hawk is described as *τρίορχος*, indicating not only a particular species (*buteo vulgaris*) but also a "three-balled male," with the connotations of "great virility" and "being well-endowed."[70] Fr. 8 (*ὥσπερ ἔγχελυς κατὰ γλοιοῦ*) is probably sexual as well.[71]

Hipponax:
The presentation of sexual scenes is abundant, detailed, graphic, unabashed, and on occasion approaches the grotesque. The poet is quite forthcoming about references to male and female genitalia: *διάσφαγμα*, 2a; *φαλέω*, 21; *κωλῆ*, 75.1; *πυγιστί*, *πυγεῶνα*, *ὄρχιν*, 92; *πρωκτῶι*, 104.32; *τράμιν*, 114a. Elsewhere the poet refers to them metaphorically: *θύμος* ("manhood"), 10.1, *σίφων* (pipe), 56, and *ἀλλᾶντα* (sausage), 84.17, indicate a penis; *σαπρόν* (rope), 24, is the penis of an old man; *γληχῶνος* (pennyroyal), 84.4, refers to pubic hair; *λῶπος* (dress), 2, is the vagina. In fr. 6 West reads *ἐν χειμῶνι* but Schneidewin, *ἐν λειμῶνι* (meadow), which again may be an allusion to the pubic region.[72]

Fr. 15 mentions the sexual relationship between Arete and Bupalus (*συνῴκησας*, cf. Ar. *Pax* 708).[73] Frr. 16 and 17 depict erotic encounters between the speaker and Arete (fr. 17 describes fellatio, cf. *κύψασα γάρ μοι*). Fr. 62 mentions a naked man lying on bed (*ἐν †ταμείωι τε καὶ χαυμενίωι γυμνόν*) and fr. 84, despite its poor condi-

---

[68] Henderson 1975: 20.

[69] For the more general function of the erotic in this fragment see Osborne 2001: 58: Sem. 7 provides a close parallel to the situation described by Freud, that its misogyny is designed to be found sexually exciting and that it fits squarely with the more directly erotic sympotic poems of Archilochus and Anacreon.

[70] Henderson 1975: 121, 125.

[71] Cf. West 1974: 179; Brown 1997: 77-8. Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 175-6 suggest that *ἔγχελυς* is plausibly a metaphor for a wily person.

[72] Henderson 1975: 20, 27, 136. For the use by Hipponax of the terms *δορίαλλος*, *μύρτος*, *χοῖρος*, *κύσθος*, all of which mean "vagina," see Tzetzes (fr. 174). Löffler 1999: 35-6 proposes that *τόν[δε] ῥῖνα* (Hip. 78.14) be emended to *τὸν περῖνα* (*περῖνος: τὸ αἰδοῖον*).

[73] For the sexual connotations of *συνοικῶ*, cf. Henderson 1975: 65.

tion, offers a vivid account of a sexual scene.[74] Fr. 92 is even more graphic: it contains anal penetration and sexual stimulation or perhaps some other kind of treatment of the speaker, by a female hitting him on his penis with a branch in a filthy environment. Fr. 104 also involves sex, odors, and food, probably at a prostitute's place (l. 34). In fr. 82 we can still read the word *κυσοχήνηι*, which Hesychius explains by offering two different meanings: *εὐρυπρωκτία* and *ξύλον ἐν ᾧ ἁμαρτάνουσαι αἱ πόρναι ἐδεσμεύοντο*. In either case, the context must have been sexual, explicitly or implicitly. In fr. 104.12 we read *ἀσκαρίζοντα* (fornicating), and in fr. 113.3,]*κύψαν*[. In fr. 77.1 *Κ*]*υψοῦ* may be a pun referring to fellatio and a parody of the Homeric Calypso,[75] while in fr. 104.34 the female is called *πόρνη* and in fr. 21 the prostitute is depicted asking the amount of eight obols for her services.[76] The word *ἀποδέφομαι* in fr. 78.16 signifies masturbation.

Sexual language is a vehicle for abuse, on occasion direct: in fr. 41, an enemy is threatening the speaker to make him *σύκινον*, that is, to make him similar to the wood of the fig-tree; the well-known porous quality of the fig-tree's wood suggests availability for sexual penetration. In fr. 26.3 the man who has foolishly devoured his inheritance is compared to a eunuch (*ὥσπερ...εὐνοῦχος*); cf. also fr. 148, in which one of the speaker's targets is called *ἡμίανδρος* and fr. 28.1, where Mimnes the painter is called *κατωμόχανος*, suggesting incessant lust for rear penetration. In fr. 12.2 Bupalus is accused of sleeping with his mother (*μητροκοίτης*) and so is the unidentified character of fr. 70.7-8 (*ὃς κατευδούσης τῆς μητρὸς ἐσκύλευσεν τὸν βρύσσον*).[77]

---

[74] *ἐκδύντες...ἐδάκνομέν τε κἀφιλέομεν...γυμνούς...ἐγὼ δ' ἐβίνεον ἐπ' ἄκρον ἕλκων ὥσπερ ἀλλᾶντα ψήχων...*

[75] Henderson 1975: 72.

[76] Sitzler, cited by Masson 1962: 117. The line translates strangely into English: "She asks for half an *ἑκτεύς* to chisel his penis" (*ἡμίεκτον αἰτεῖ τοῦ φάλεω κολάψαι ἑ*). "Chiseling" is an odd way to express manual arousal, but Hipponax is known for unconventional language, cf. his expression *πάντα ἄνδρα ἀπεσκόλυπτεν* ("she skinned every man"); also Catullus 58.5 *glubere* (peel, strip the bark from), describing sexual voracity.

[77] The son strips his mother's *βρύσσον*, "sea-urchin," while she is asleep. *βρύσσος* in Hipponax is the same as *βύττος* in Hesychius, that is, *γυναικὸς αἰδοῖον*.

2. *Low Social Class*

Archilochus:

In fr. 19 the speaker, Aristotle informs us, is Charon, whose profession is that of a carpenter. In fr. 25.5 the "I" identifies himself as a soothsayer (*μάντις*). In the extant lines we find no prophecy; in the second half of the fragment, however, the speaker seems to mention a special quality given to him by Zeus (]*γάρ μοι Ζεὺς πατὴρ Ὀλυμπίων / ἔ]θηκε κἀγαθὸν μετ' ἀνδράσι*, 6-7). Fr. 24 has as its subject the speaker's relief and joy over the return of a young man from a sea-trip to Gortyn. The latter is a merchant (*φορτίων*, 8, indicates the cargo of a commercial ship) but his relationship with the former remains obscure. The speaker may be a family member or possibly part of the commercial enterprise, if we are to infer from the passage, which seems to run something to the effect of "I do not care about the cargo being lost as long as you are safe."[78] In fr. 67 the speaker claims that he knows "some other cure for such a growth" (*ἐσθλὴν γὰρ ἄλλην οἶδα τοιούτου φυτοῦ / ἴησιν*, 3-4), which may suggest that he is a physician, an *ἰατρός*.[79] West has argued that the "growth" here is in fact an erect penis (cf. *φῦμα μηρῶν μεταξύ*, fr. 66), and "*ἐπεισίῳ*, if rightly recognized in l. 11, is confirmation of a sexual context."[80] It is indeed tempting to take the poem as sexual, but several considerations suggest otherwise. In the first place, there are two possible indications for the practice of a medical procedure: in l. 1,].*τομηι* is a derivative from *τέμνω* (*ἐκτέμνω*, *ἀποτέμνω*); it represents perhaps *ἐκτομή* or *ἀποτομή* and signifies incision. In l. 8 *λίνου* probably indicates the linen cloth which is to be used to wrap the open wound. *ἄλλην* (*ἴησιν*) does not necessarily juxtapose the medical procedure with what follows after the line; in fact *γάρ* seems to be connective with the preceding lines, the incision being part of the alternative remedy. The use of two verbs in the first person future (]*λήσομαι* after *τομηι* and]*ήσομαι* just above *λίνου*) suggest an active initiative on the speaker's part that fits well with the sense of pride and confidence that permeates the fragment (cf. *ἐσθλήν*, *οἶδα*).[81] If the remedy for the "growth" is a woman, one

---

[78] For a similar "welcome" motif, cf. Thgn. 511-2: *ἦλθες δή Κλεάριστε βαθὺν διὰ πόντον ἀνύσσας / ἐνθάδ' ἐπ' οὐδὲν ἔχοντ' ὦ τάλαν οὐδὲν ἔχων.*

[79] Fr. 65, surviving as an incomplete word, may also mention a physician,]*ιητρ*[.

[80] West 1974: 125-6.

[81] Cf. the boastful remark of the cook in Sem. 24: *κῶς ⟨ὗν⟩ ἀπεῦσα…καὶ γὰρ οὐ κακῶς ἐπίσταμαι.*

would expect here the role of the speaker to be less prominent and emphatic. Other professions in the trimeters of Archilochus include: a thief (*φιλήτης*) in fr. 49; hetaerae or prostitutes in frr. 30, 31, 42, and also 48, if the nurse (*τροφός*) of 48.5 is a procuress, as is very likely; and a cowherd (*βουκόλος*) in fr. 25.

Semonides:
Fr. 16 features a merchant and probably a prostitute. In fr. 24 the speaker is a cook who prides himself on his expertise in the art of sacrificing. In fr. 20 it is stated that shepherds have the tradition of sacrificing to the Nymphs and Hermes because these gods are of the same stock (*οὗτοι γὰρ ἀνδρῶν αἷμ' ἔχουσι ποιμένων*).[82] In one of the lost poems Semonides mentioned a *κύβηβος*, a begging priest of Cybele (fr. 36).

Hipponax:
His shadowy characters belong to a social sub-stratum where poverty is endemic. In fr. 3a the speaker describes himself as a *φώρ* (thief) and prays to Hermes, his patron god, in an attempt to enlist his help.[83] In fr. 79 another thief (*φιλήτης*) is mentioned, who has stolen Hipponax's dog; and in fr. 102.12, a third one (*φιλήτην*) becomes the target of the speaker's wrath (cf. *καρκίνου*, *κατηρῆσθαι*) in an obscure context. In fr. 104.34 the profession of the female is mentioned explicitly: she is a prostitute (*πόρνη*), like the woman in fr. 21 who asks money for her services. In fr. 28 the captain of the ship on the side of which the painter Mimnes paints his much-maligned snake is mentioned twice, and in fr. 51 someone, most likely a sailor or shipbuilder, covers the keel of the ship with melted wax. In fr. 44 the surviving line probably comes from the direct speech of a merchant or a street hustler who is trying to strike a deal by emphasizing his willingness to leave the bargained item for a low price (*εὔωνον*). In fr. 79.18 we encounter a tavern-keeper and, in the following line, presumably, a servant who is sweeping the floor. Cicon, one of the repeatedly abused characters, is presented as soothsayer (*καύης*) in fr. 4, and a midwife

---

[82] For another possible translation of the fragment as "for they (who are sacrificing) are of shepherd stock," see Gerber 1999: 325n.1. A pastoral or agricultural environment is also suggested by the gloss *τρασιά* (fr. 39), indicating the crates in which figs and corn, and even cheese, are dried.

[83] For the term *σκαπερδεῦσαι* in the same fragment as indicating the occupation of a burglar, see West 1974: 29; Brown 1997: 81-2.

(*ὀμφαλητόμος*) is mentioned in a rhetorical question in fr. 19 in the context of an attack against the addressee.

Hipponax also mentions slaves: in frr. 13-4 Arete and her companion are depicted drinking, but not from a *κύλιξ*, because the slave (*παῖς*) fell and broke it.[84] In fr. 26 a man who has wasted his inherited fortune has been reduced to lowly status and is forced to work hard (*σκάπτειν πέτρας ὀρείας*) and eat poor food (*σῦκα μέτρια...καὶ κρίθινον κόλλικα*), characteristic of the diet of slaves (*δούλιον χόρτον*). In fr. 28 Mimnes is described as *νικύρτας* ("*esclave né d'un esclave*"[85]), the foreign term probably intended to intensify the invective.[86] The reference to slaves in fr. 27 is general, denoting the barbarians who, when captured, are sold into slavery (*Φρύγας*) at Miletus to grind barley.[87] Fr. 40 is the prayer of a slave who requests that the gods save him from the beatings of his cold-hearted master (*καί με δεσπότεω βεβροῦ / λαχόντα λίσσομαί σε μὴ ῥαπίζεσθαι*).

3. *Mythological References*

Archilochus:

It has been suggested by Schneidewin that fr. 34 comes from a mythological narrative, on the basis of information by the scholiast to Apollonius Rhodius that Archilochus mentions an encounter of the centaur Nessus with Deianeira and Heracles in the River Euenus (fr. 288). Schneidewin suggests that the line *ἀμισθὶ γάρ σε πάμπαν οὐ διάξομεν* is spoken by Nessus, and thus "we" refers to him and his fellow centaurs negotiating Deianeira's passage across the flooded river. The scholiast, however, does not specify the meter of the poem, which would have been of great help, since mythological subjects appear in a variety of genres.[88]

---

[84] But see Golden 1982: 73-5, who prefers *παῖς* in its traditional meaning, "child," as in Homer. Although he concedes that fr. 13 contains two words (*πελλίς, καταράσσω*) with no earlier attestation, and *παῖς* as "slave" may be another, he thinks that the fragment alludes to a young man who is sleeping with a woman old enough to be his mother.

[85] Masson 1962: 121, in light of Hesychius' gloss *νικύρτας*, meaning *δουλέκδουλος*.

[86] See Lévêque 1997: 23 and Tedeschi 1981: 135 ff. on the cultural and linguistic significance of the foreign terms.

[87] Cf. Gerber 1999: 373 for the connotation of "Phrygian" as "slave."

[88] Cf. also Notopoulos' 1966: 314-5 contention that in Archilochus mythological narratives appear only in epic poetry. West 1974: 30-1 thinks that there is no reason to doubt that the treatment of the Deianeira story is a serious one; also Podlecki 1984:

In fr. 25.8 there is a reference to Eurymas, but the whole poem is an enigmatic mixture of abstract thought, a series of brief *exempla*, and statements in the first person. The identity of Eurymas, too, remains problematic: according to Hesychius, he had tried unsuccessfully to create friction between the Dioskouri;[89] perhaps he was also a mythological seer.[90] In either case, the extant lines indicate that the fragment is not mythological and that the reference to Eurymas is made, rather, in passing.[91]

Semonides:
Fr. 41 survives as a textually uncertain line without a subject or a verb: †*ἐν εὐδετέω ὥσπερ*† *Λέσβιος Πρύλις*. Prylis was the man who revealed in what way Troy would be captured. The reference to him appears to be in a simile: perhaps the poet mentions some betrayal and the violator is compared to the mythological figure.[92]

Hipponax:
Fr. 63 mentions Myson, one of the Seven Sages; fr. 72 has as its subject the death of Rhesus near the towers of Troy; frr. 74-7 may utilize some themes or situations of an Odyssean story; fr. 102 makes a reference to one of the labors of Heracles; and the very mutilated fr. 105 contains the name *Βάραγχος*, a soothsayer who cured Miletus of pestilence and who was the ancestor of the Branchidae, guardians of the oracle of Didyma.

---

51. Brown 2001: 429-32 suggests that the statement by Gaetulicus (*Ἀρχίλοχος*) *Μοῦσαν Ἐχιδναίῳ πρῶτος ἔβαψε χόλῳ*, *A.P.* 7.71.2, may allude not just to Archilochus as an aggressive satirist but more specifically to Heracles' slaying of the centaur Nessus with those very poisoned arrows.

89 Lobel, *P. Oxy.* 2310 fr. 1.

90 Lasserre and Bonnard 1958: 13: in *Od.* 9.509 *Τήλεμος Εὐρυμίδης* is a soothsayer (*ὃς μαντοσύνῃς ἐκέκαστο*), which suggests that his father was also a *μάντις*, since the gift of prophecy was transferred from one generation to the next.

91 If Eurymas is taken here as a mythological provocateur, the speaker perhaps warns or threatens someone who has tried to create problems between him and another person; if Eurymas is understood as a seer, the speaker, also a seer (l. 5), may compare himself to the mythological *μάντις*.

92 Pellizer and Tedeschi 1990: 116-8 suggest that Prylis, a diviner, was not known primarily for this skill and reject Crusius' view that here Semonides ridicules the naïve practice of divination. Prylis was instead known as a traitor to his city, and the speaker may be denouncing a friend or a relative who revealed a secret.

Frr. 102 and 105 give us good indications that, despite their mythological references, they do not come from mythological narratives.[93] The same is probably true of frr. 74-7, although here there is less context: frr. 74 and 77.2 contain *οδυ*[and *αιηκασ*[respectively, which Lobel plausibly restores as *οδυ*[*σσε* and *Φαίηκας*, and in fr. 77.4 we read *βου*[, restored by Diehl as *Βού*[*παλος*. What we may have in these fragments is an episode alluding to or parodying the adventures of Odysseus in Phaeacia, with Bupalus likened perhaps to an adversary and the poet identifying with the wily Homeric hero.[94]

The remaining two references, however, are more difficult to assess. Fr. 63 consists of one line and a half (*καὶ Μύσων, ὃν Ὡπόλλων / ἀνεῖπεν ἀνδρῶν σωφρονέστατον πάντων*) and refers to the episode in which Anacharsis asks the Pythia whether there is a man wiser than he and she responds by declaring Myson, a Thessalian workman, the wisest of all men (Diog. 1.106-8). Fr. 72 mentions the death of Rhesus, king of the Aeneians:

> *ἐπ' ἁρμάτων τε καὶ Θρεϊκίων πώλων*
> *λευκῶν †ὀείους κατεγγὺς† Ἰλίου πύργων*
> *ἀπηναρίσθη Ῥῆσος, Αἰνειῶν πάλμυς*

Knox describes the lines as having an "epic quality"[95] but the foreign term *πάλμυς* (sultan, shah) suggests an element of subversion which undermines their seriousness.[96]

---

[93] In fr. 102 the reference to the hydra of Lerna (*ὕδρον ἐν Λέρνῃ*, 17) occurs near the name *Κίκων*, one of the adversaries of the poet, and vocabulary associated with invective rather than a narrative of one of the Labors (*μήνυτρον*, 4; *φιλήτην*, 12; *κατηρῆσθαι*, 13). Hipponax is probably using the mythological theme to assault Cicon, who may have been likened to the monster. In fr. 105 we may have a similar situation. The name of the mythical prophet Baranchus is almost immediately followed by the familiar thematic motifs of money (*στατῆρας πέντε*, 8), animals (*κυνός*, 9), and sexuality (*μυσαχνός*, 10). No adversary's proper name appears, but elsewhere (frr. 4, 4a) we are informed that Cicon is a soothsayer (of poor quality). Hipponax may be ridiculing here his incompetence by contrasting him to a mythological seer.

[94] West 1974: 30-1 cautiously takes the fragments as a treatment of the Odysseus story in a comic spirit. Rosen 1990: 25 is more confident: "In frr. 74-7 we have a situation in which Odysseus, doubtless a loosely veiled stand-in for the figure of the poet, is presented at his most abject and vulnerable: nearly destroyed in his shipwreck in a strange and quietly hostile land, at the mercy of the king and the queen. Once again, the portrait of the poet that emerges from his identification with such an Odysseus is that of the oppressed underdog."

[95] Knox 1985: 123.

[96] West 1974: 30 remarks that in Hipponax foreign vocabulary and rough pronunciation of words are conscious literary devices to characterize vulgar speech.

C. *In Two Poets*

1. *Prayer*

Archilochus:

In fr. 26 the speaker prays to Apollo to make his enemies suffer and to destroy them (*πήμαινε, ὄλλυ'*). The extant lines cover only the curse against the foes, but the prayer clearly has an oppositional structure, as indicated by the use of the conjunctions *μέν, δέ*. The prayer continues with a request for protection for the speaker and his group, see *ἡμέας δέ* [.

Hipponax:

In fr. 3a the speaker invokes Hermes in his capacity as the protector of thieves to assist him. In fr. 32 he prays to the same god to provide him with a number of items of clothing and sixty staters of gold.[97] In fr. 35 the speaker again invokes Hermes. In fr. 36 "Hipponax" complains to Plutus, who has never come to him to give him money and other goods; and in fr. 38, to Zeus, who has never given him gold and silver.[98] In fr. 40 the speaker is a slave who prays to Malis (perhaps the Lydian counterpart of Athena), asking for her help to avoid beatings by his master.

2. *Topography/Distant Lands*

Archilochus:

In fr. 21 Thasos is likened to the backbone of an ass; in fr. 22 it is compared unfavorably to the rich area around the river Siris (on the gulf of Tarentum).[99] Athenaeus' statement *καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος ὁ ποιητὴς*

Perhaps even the changes he introduces into his iambic trimeter and trochaic tetrameter (long penultimate syllable) is "a deliberate crashing in correctness emphasizing the clumsy uneducated character that is being projected." See also Mason 1962: 31; Kurke 1999: 59.

97 Fr. 34 in which the speaker asks the addressee to provide him with a heavy cloak and woolly boots probably comes from the same prayer as fr. 32, cf. Mason 1962: 126.

98 Hays 1994: 12-4: "These poems are funny not simply because of the pathetic contrast between 'Hipponax's' grandiloquent address and the workaday items requested, but more specifically because they confuse and travesty fixed and rather delicate guidelines for making requests." Cf. also in fr. 38 the improbable description of Zeus as *Ὀλυμπίων πάλμυν,* which creates a deliberately comic effect. On the subversive nature of Hipponax's prayers, see also Kurke 1999: 59-60.

99 Frr. 21 and 22 probably belong to the same poem; cf. Gerber 1970: 20.

ὑπερτεθαύμακε τὴν χώραν τῶν Σιριτῶν διὰ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν (523d) in the context of the poet's negative description of Thasos suggests that the pronounced differences between the two places were presented through a description of Siris as well.[100] In fr. 23 there are no references revealing the identity of either the male speaker, who seems to be high-born[101] and hold some military office, or the addressee, a powerful female; the geographical setting is also obscure. The entire situation, however (if not erotic or total parody), indicates that the episode is set in a foreign environment, fantastic or otherwise.[102]

Hipponax:
In fr. 42 the poet mentions a number of monuments of Lydia (*Ἀτράλεω τύμβον, σῆμα Γύγεω, Σεσώστριος στήλην, μνῆμα Τωτος Μυτάλιδι πάλμυδος*). The fragment is part of a set of directions to a traveler who is heading toward Smyrna (*τὴν ἐπὶ Σμύρνης*, 1) from the interior. In fr. 50 the location of someone's house is provided with specificity: he lives in Smyrna, between an area called Tracheia and the promontory Lepra. Topographical details of Miletus (the islet of Lade, a boundary, the marketplace, a reference to "near the sea") appear also in fr. 103, probably in the context of some characters' wanderings through the city.[103]

---

[100] It is rather unlikely that the poet himself visited this distant region. For the view that Siris actually may be the river Syros in the region of Propontis, see Gerber 1999: 97. On the correlation between Archilochus' status as a colonizer and the nature of his poetry, see Ford 1993: 59-73.

[101] His reassurances that his lineage does not make him prone to betrayal of friends brings to mind Theognis: *οὐδέ τινα προὔδωκα φίλον καὶ πιστὸν ἑταῖρον, / οὐδ' ἐν ἐμῇ ψυχῇ δούλιον οὐδὲν ἔνι*, 529-30.

[102] Slings 1987: 6 (with references to Peek, Kamerbeek, and Treu) thinks that we should take the poem at face value and understand the female addressee as a kind of "seventh-century Artemisia." See also Clay 1986: 7-17: the woman is the wife of Candaules confronting Gyges with the choice of either killing Candaules or dying himself.

[103] A note on Solon: ancient testimonies, supported by the poet's own poetry (fr. 19.1-4 W), indicate that he was linked to the *oikismos* of the Soloi, see Irwin 1999: 187. But in his extant iambic corpus no such reference exists. Frr. 38-40 on occasion have been interpreted as referring to unfamiliar ethnographic customs that Solon encountered during his travels abroad (Masarachia) or even to utopian lands (Ceccareli), cf. above on *Food/Eating*.

III. General Observations

The data gathered in the previous section suggest that the thematic elements that appear in archaic Greek triemeters can be distributed as following:

Only in the first generation: animal fable.

Only in the first two generations: military references.

In all three generations: food, wine drinking, invective, serious reflection, narrative (in all four poets); sexual references, low social class, mythological references (in Archilochus, Semonides and Hipponax); prayer, and topography or distant setting (in Archilochus and Hipponax).

The list above, however, simply indicates the presence of a thematic element in a particular poet: the treatment of that element may on occasion be inconsequential, appearing only in passing, even figuratively. As a corrective measure we attempt below a brief evaluation of the significance of each thematic element for the corpus in which it appears and also for the trimeters as a genre.

A. *Themes Occurring Only in the First Generation*

Animal Fable

At least two of the extant fragments of Archilochus (35, 41) and two of Semonides (9, 13) seem to come from fables, suggesting, if we take into account their small corpora, that both poets make extensive use of them. The absence of animal fables in the poetry of Hipponax is intriguing. His corpus of trimeters is more than twice the size of those of Archilochus and Semonides,[104] and one would expect some fragment of an animal fable to have survived, had it ever existed. The poetry of Hipponax contains sixteen references to animals, and in all cases the context is, to a tolerable degree, intelligible; yet there is no indication that the poet ever uses fables.[105] One wonders whether by his time the

[104] Excluding Sem. 7, which in itself represents almost two-thirds of the poet's corpus.

[105] For a different view, see Adrados 1999: 242, who believes that absence of fables in the extant corpus of Hipponax is an accident of preservation, because they appear in the *Iambi* of Callimachus, who imitates him. Zanetto 2001: 67, too, thinks that even if no traces of fables can be found in Hipponax, considering our scarce knowledge of his work, we can conclude that the animal fable was a favorite pattern

trend is to restrict them to a different meter, perhaps the epodes. This hypothesis, however, is unverifiable, since the corpus of tetrameters or epodes postdating Archilochus is miniscule.

B. *Themes Occurring Only in the First Two Generations*

Military Language

As a whole, the trimeters are a non-military genre. Semonides contains only one reference to Ares (one of the causes of death, 1.13-4) and Solon once likens himself to the edge of a sword (37.9). Hipponax uses some terms (for instance, *κόπτω*, *βάλλω*, *καταυλίζομαι*) borrowed from the epic tradition, but they occur either in an abusive (for instance, frr. 5, 20, 37) or sexual (fr. 16) context. The extant poetries of Semonides, Solon, and Hipponax, then, contain no true military references.

Archilochus, on the other hand, is more difficult to assess: although three of the four military references are made in passing (frr. 23.18-9, 24.13, and 58), fr. 18 (*παῖδ' Ἄρεω μιηφόνου*) may be different. Whether it is part of a more substantial military passage or again a transient reference we do not know, but the suggestion that the fragment comes from an abusive poem finds no parallels in Archilochus, since Ares is always treated seriously in the poet's other meters. Likewise the fact that fr. 18 is quoted by Eustathius in the context of *Il.* 5.31 should encourage us to expect affinities between this fragment and the Iliadic lines. Fr. 20, in which the poet contemplates the misfortunes of the Thasians and compares them to those of the Magnesians (who were defeated by the Ephesians), may come from a narrative that treats of a war with an outcome unhappy for Thasos. In sum, although the extant trimeters of Archilochus contain no unequivocal military passages, they nevertheless credibly suggest military themes once or twice.

---

of archaic iambography. But this is to ignore the possibility of changing usage within the archaic period.

C. *Permanent Thematic Conventions*

1. *In All Poets*

Food/Eating:

It is one of the elements that appear in all four poets, but its distribution between the earlier and later trimeters is rather uneven: in Archilochus there are only two references, (48.2, 79) of which the former is textually uncertain. In Semonides as well, although twice as many in number, sacrifices included (23, 24, 28, 30), they are still relatively few.[106] In Solon and Hipponax, on the other hand, food is emphasized distinctly. The former, in just three short fragments (38-40, less than eight lines, probably coming from the same poem), contains ten references to different kinds of dishes. Hipponax contains forty, scattered throughout his corpus. To put it another way: the frequency of references to food in Hipponax is eight times higher than that in Archilochus and four times higher than that in Semonides (even if we count the very thematically uncertain fr. 15). The rate in Solon is very high, too, but since the distribution in Hipponax is much more uniform throughout the poems, and his corpus is almost five times larger, it is safer to use Hipponax as the main evidence that, by the third quarter of the sixth century, food and/or eating have become one of the major motifs of the trimeters. This unevenness suggests that although food was always one of the themes, it is after Archilochus and Semonides (certainly by the time of Hipponax) that its importance rises and it becomes one of the dominant elements.

Wine Drinking:

Despite its presence (or direct allusions to it) in the trimeters of all poets, it consistently remains a marginal theme. Archilochus and Semonides contain sparse references to both food and wine. But while Solon and Hipponax raise the frequency of culinary references dramatically, they refrain from doing the same with references to wine drinking. The theme keeps occurring, but it always retains a low profile.

---

[106] There are also two glosses for the words *ἤϊα* (32) and *νήστης* (38). Fr. 15 mentions four kinds of fish, but is indeterminate as to whether it is an animal fable, abusive, or gastronomic. See above on *Animal Fable*.

Invective/Abuse:
This is one of the most visible thematic characteristics of trimeters and thus is responsible for their perception as an exclusively abusive kind of poetry. In Archilochus invective is directed against either an individual or a whole group, and may focus on his/its erratic behavior (for instance, 49); sexual promiscuity (25, 82) or a physical defect (43). Invective appears in address (direct insult or sarcasm), comments on an enemy and prayer. Animal fables must have been a vehicle for abuse, too, the speaker preferring here to use metaphor instead of direct invective. Judging from the frequency of occurrences, invective must have been an important aspect of Archilochus' trimeters. In Semonides, fr. 7 combines elements from serious contemplative poetry with the language we often encounter in the poetry of abuse. Fr. 10a, a sharp, frontal attack against someone's appearance, is reminiscent of certain fragments of Archilochus (49) and Hipponax (28). The presence of animal fables indicates that Semonides, too, uses this literary technique as a means of attack.

In Hipponax enemies are presented as fools, incompetents, sexual deviants (homosexuals, committers of incest), transgressors of moral laws, and therefore sources of pollution. While in Archilochus there is normally some explanation for the reason of hostility (as a rule there is an interaction between the "I" and the target/addressee), in Hipponax the source of animosity is often left unspoken. What distinguishes Hipponax even more markedly, however, is the presence in his poems of an unparalleled language of physical violence: in a large number of fragments there are references to the practice of *καθαρμός*, a process of pummeling and beating. In fr. 20 the speaker threatens to hurt his enemy with a club. In fr. 84 Bupalus, who interrupts the speaker's sexual encounter, is promised that he will "cry" (*κλαίειν κελεύων Βούπαλον*, 18)—more colloquially, he will be "sent to hell." In fr. 79.5 the line is mutilated, but we can still read *κηρίνους ἐποι*[(*κηρίνους ποιεῖν*: make someone pliable as wax). Verbs like *βάλλω/-ομαι* (5, 37), *ῥαπίζω/-ομαι* (6, 10, 40), *κόπτω* (20), *λεύω* (37), *κατασκήπτω* (71), *ἀποπνίγω* (102), *συντρίβω* (102), *πυκταλίζω* (102), *καταπλίσσω* (104), *τίλλω* (114a), adjectives like *αὐχενοπλήξ* (102) and lines like *οἱ δέ μεο ὀδόντες / ἐν ταῖς γνάθοισι πάντες ἐκκεκινέαται* (73.5) give testimony to the fact that in the poetic world of Hipponax, abundant in animosity and confrontation, violence is not always restricted to the verbal level. While in Archilochus and Semonides there is no physical violence (or

little, against the "dog-woman" *ἐξαράξειεν λίθωι ὀδόντας*, Sem. 7.17-8), in Hipponax it becomes a prominent element.

Serious Reflection:
Archilochus addresses issues of wealth and power (f19); he comments on the importance of human relationships through the speaker's elation and relief over the return of a loved one from a dangerous trip (24); he ponders communities struck by misfortunes, perhaps war or civil strife (20), and reflects on the individuality of personal taste (25). In Semonides, serious themes are even more visible, a substantial part of his poetry treating issues such as the helplessness of the human condition (1, 4, 42), the miseries of old age (1), the inescapability of death (1, 2, 3), acquisition of virtue (5) and the character of women (6, 7). The extensive use of such themes in Semonides is an eloquent testimony to the profound diversity of subject matter in the early trimeters, and especially their focus on certain themes that bring them close to elegy. Solon, too, in the largest part of his surviving trimeters dedicates his thoughts to serious matters, more precisely the public reforms that he initiated in Athens (36, 37). He ponders the miserable condition of the people, which has led many to lose their freedom, and the necessity of the socio-economic changes that have taken place.

In Hipponax serious issues are absent. The one-line fr. 67, in which the poet states that drunken people lose their wits, has a vague contemplative flavor, but with the context missing it is impossible to tell. We must note, however, that the fragment treats of a group of people susceptible to becoming targets of invective. It is quite conceivable that on occasion Hipponax abandons the assault of individuals and concentrates on larger groups to which his foe happens to belong; but such statements of generalized invective hardly qualify as serious reflection. It is noteworthy that nowhere in his poetry do we find themes like human fragility, old age, human bonding, socio-political realities and such, which we encounter in Archilochus, Semonides and Solon. His (rare) generalizing statements contain an element of aggression, and it seems that they should be understood as part of his strategies of abuse.[107]

[107] Fr. 68 (a woman is good only on the first day of her marriage and the day of her funeral), if genuine, fits well within the parameters of this type of abuse.

Narrative:
Narrative, as the telling of a story or the reporting of an incident, seems to have been a prominent element in archaic trimeters, as Bowie has suggested convincingly. Among other things, it may include dialogue, the description of an erotic encounter, or even the recounting of an animal fable. Although in most cases it is impossible to determine with confidence the narratological setting of the extant fragments, there is good reason to believe that narrative appears in all three generations, with a more pronounced presence in the poetry of Hipponax. Archilochus seems to be more sparing in his use of narrative than Semonides; and Solon's limited corpus gives us only one self-referential report on the social reforms he initiated. Hipponax, on the other hand, routinely uses narrative as a means to unfold the lives of his persona and other characters that appear in his poetry. His narrative is detailed and contributes greatly to the creation of a poetic world which is more concrete and more objectified than that of his predecessors.

2. *In Three Poets*

Sexual language:
Archilochus, Semonides and Hipponax use sexual terms and depict erotic scenes graphically. Sexually explicit references must have been one of the important characteristics of the genre throughout the archaic period, functioning as a means of invective as well, frequently in denials of someone's manliness, cf., *εὐνοῦχος*, Hip. 26; *κατωμόχανε*, Hip. 28; *σύκινον*, Hip. 41; *κυσοχήνηι* (= *εὐρυπρωκτία*), Hip. 82. In Archilochus, in addition to fr. 42 (prostitute performing fellatio), there are a number of other fragments that probably depict a sexual act (39, 43, 45, and perhaps 36). In four cases the male organ is mentioned (*σάθη*, 25, 43 and 82; *φῦμα*, 66), and the context, when available, seems always to be abusive. In Semonides, fr. 17 depicts anal intercourse, and from the comments of Clement on fr. 16 we understand that this poem, too, was sexual throughout. Semonides also gives us a hint that explicit language is used in animal fables as well: the hawk in fr. 9.2 is called *τρίορχος*, a manifest pun on his virility. In Hipponax sexual language is even more intense and more encompassing: references to male and female genitalia or description of erotic scenes with little or no restraint constitute one of the most important characteristics of his poetry. The presentation is not only detailed, graphic and

shameless, but on occasion approaches the ludicrous. An erotic scene in Hipponax is almost never uneventful or undisturbed, becoming thus a source of new developments and animosities in the larger tableau of action.

The frequency of sexual references is highest in Hipponax: twenty-four of eighty-four fragments contain at least one sexual reference (29%), as compared to eight of forty-five fragments (18%) in Archilochus, and three of thirty-two (9%) in Semonides. In short, although sexual references occur in both Archilochus and Semonides, they are conspicuously more frequent in Hipponax, appearing in almost a third of his fragments.

Low Social Class:
In the trimeters a wide variety of professions is associated with physical activity and craftsmanship (carpenters, merchants, shepherds, thieves, physicians, seers, etc.). In Archilochus there are clues that hint at both urban and rural settings, while in Semonides several references to professions of the countryside suggest that a considerable part of his poetry is set in an agricultural or pastoral milieu.[108] Hipponax presents us with an urban environment.

The greatest difference, however, between Hipponax and his predecessors is that he is the only poet whose trimeters include slaves. Archilochus contains no reference to them at all. Semonides makes a reference to *δούλι' ἔργα* (7.58) when he mentions the "horse-woman," but he uses the expression to signify manual tasks: this type of woman is so conscious of her own beauty that she does not use her hands for any kind of work. Solon also makes a reference to slavery when he describes the condition of the people before his reforms, when Athens was virtually enslaved (*δουλεύουσα*; *πολλούς...πραθέντας*, 36.7-9), but he refers to whole classes of citizens, those who fell victim to poverty and unjust laws. Hipponax, on the other hand, features individual characters who are slaves: in fr. 13 the *παῖς*, falling, breaks the cylix; in fr. 26 an irresponsible, formerly wealthy man is now reduced to a slave's status, working hard and eating *δούλιον χόρτον*; in fr. 40 the very speaker himself is a slave praying to the gods to deliver him from his master's cruel punishment. There is also another reference to

[108] Cf. also Lloyd-Jones 1975: 24, who points out that fr. 7 seems to have been written from the point of view of a peasant.

slaves in fr. 27, but there they appear as a large group rather than individuals (the barbarians who are captured and enslaved).

The presence of slaves may be explained by the fact that, in essence, Hipponax transforms the working class of the previous iambic tradition into an underclass: incompetent men who do not measure up to the standards of their profession, suspicious characters, tramps, prostitutes and thieves create an environment considerably different from that which is found in Archilochus and Semonides. Not that there are no thieves or prostitutes in Archilochus; there are. But frequently the characters are presented as members of a healthier and more productive class as compared to those of Hipponax. We can even detect a sense of pride in them: the soothsayer of fr. 23 boasts of the usefulness of his advice; the physician of fr. 67 displays noticeable confidence and self-esteem; the speaker of fr. 24 reveals inner nobility when he emphasizes the priority of a beloved merchant's return over money and cargo. In Semonides, too, the cook prides himself on his knowledge of the sacrificial arts. In Archilochus there are no references to poverty or lack of money, food or clothes. We do not know whether the characters are materially comfortable (which they could be),[109] but they are generally depicted with a dignified face. Semonides, small as his corpus is apart from fr. 7, appears to present us with a similar situation. It is Hipponax who twists the traditional role of the working-class characters and turns them into an underclass: dirty,[110] hungry, lacking adequate clothing and wishfully dreaming of extravagant amounts of money.

Mythological References:

There is no clear evidence that the trimeters treat of mythological subjects. In Archilochus the reference to Eurymas in fr. 25.8 is in passing;

---

[109] Status and social mobility in archaic Greece were in intense flux due to new economic conditions. The creation of trading posts throughout the Mediterranean and the subsequent development of commerce became the source of considerable wealth for a class of professional traders (Hdt. 4.152); cf. Murray 1980: 209 ff.

[110] Among the four poets, Hipponax contains by far the most scatological references. In addition to expressions, like *μεσσηγυδορποχέστης* (fr. 114c), on several occasions we are told that the characters operate in a totally filthy environment, cf. *βόλβιτος* (fr. 92.9), *λαύρη* (frr. 61, 92.10). West 1984: 112 thinks that Sem. 13 comes from a scatological narrative, as Sem. frr. 8 and 17 possibly do. See also Sem. 7.3-6. For the abusive, comic and obscene functions of scatology, cf. Carrière 1979: 135 ff.; for scatology as an effective means of attack upon elite pretensions, see Kurke 1999: 35. On the uses of the *κόπρος* motif, see Schwartz 1975: 195.

Schneidewin's suggestion, however, that fr. 34 may come from a scene depicting the encounter of Heracles and Deianeira with Nessus is quite attractive, but the fragment is too short to inspire confidence. Semonides, too, mentions a mythological figure (Prylis) but only in a simile, if the text is correct. Hipponax contains several mythological references, but most of them seem to appear in an abusive context. Frr. 63 (Myson, pronounced by Apollo the wisest of men) and 72 (death of Rhesus) are more difficult: whether they come from longer mythological passages or are just short references we cannot tell. Certainly Hipponax would not hesitate to compare sarcastically a foolish adversary to the wisest of all men or to illustrate the threat of a devastating nocturnal attack against an enemy by using as an example the Iliadic episode in which the Thracians are killed during the sleep of their king Rhesus (10. 434ff.).[111] Frr. 74-7, 102, 105 and also the epic expressions used in a non-epic (often sexual) context[112] should give us pause while considering the seriousness of frr. 63 and 72. Yet all this does not constitute in itself evidence that the last two fragments are in the same burlesque mode. More relevant may be the fact that frr. 63 and 72 encapsulate the kernel of the mythological episodes in just a few lines, thus suggesting not extensive treatments but references in passing in the service of other thematic objectives. In short, if the trimeters ever contained mythological narratives these are more likely to have appeared in Archilochus, for whom there is credible testimony (Dio Chrys. 60.1; schol. *ad Il.* 21.237; schol. *ad Ap. Rhod.* 1.1212-19a) that he did treat of such subjects.

3. *In Two Poets*

Prayer:

Archilochus' corpus contains one prayer (fr. 26), while Hipponax's has as many as seven. The request is either for punishment of enemies (Archilochus) or for help and remedy from the hardships of poverty and the indignities associated with the social sub-stratum (Hipponax). The latter poet's focus on this particular social milieu may explain

---

[111] See also Mason 1962: 141-3.

[112] Cf., for instance, *δοκέων ἐκεῖνον τῆι βακτηρίηι κόψαι* (fr. 20) with *κόπτοντες δούρεσι μετάφρενον*, *Od.* 8.528, 18.335, *Il.* 23.690, etc.; the verb *βάλλω, -ομαι* (frr. 5, 37), with *Il.* 4.473, 15.495, 16.807, and so on. Hipponax's sleeping with Arete (fr. 16) is indicated by the epic term *κατηυλίσθην*; cf. also in the same fragment the very Homeric expression *δεξιῶι ῥωιδιῶι*.

both the high frequency of prayers in his corpus and the nature of their content.

Topography/Distant Setting:
Archilochus refers to the appearance and/or geography of Thasos (fr. 21) and Siris (fr. 22). In fr. 23 the setting is uncertain, but the episode between the female ruler and her male interlocutor probably takes place in a foreign land. Hipponax mentions a number of landmarks of Lydia (fr. 42) and elsewhere provides topographical details of Miletus (fr. 50). Although references to distant lands, with at least some elaboration on their topography and perhaps their people, seem to occur throughout the period under consideration, they are nevertheless probably limited to a secondary role.

CHART OF THEMES IN THE TRIMETERS

	Arch.	Sem.	Sol.	Hip.
Animal Fable	x	x		
Military	x?			
Food/Eating	x	x	x	x
Wine Drinking	x	x	x	x
Invective	x	x	x	x
Serious Reflection	x	x	x	
Narrative	x	x	x	x
Sexual	x	x		x
Low Social Class	x	x		x
Mythological	x?			
Prayer	x			x
Topography/Distant Places	x			x

Let us, then, recapitulate the data of this chapter. While the poetry of the first generation alone contains animal fable and perhaps military topics, there is a large number of themes that survive down to the time of Hipponax. Yet many of these undergo a transformation, since Hipponax either expands them or drives their possibilities to the extremes. The most noteworthy difference between Hipponax and the other three poets, however, is that he abandons the tradition of treatment of serious themes. While the trimeters of Archilochus, Semonides and Solon present two faces—abusive on one hand and serious on the other—the poetry of Hipponax is monolithically abusive. With the

abandonment of their serious aspects, the trimeters have now become narrower and more predictable in terms of subject matter. Is this a real trend of the later sixth century or a peculiarity of Hipponax as an individual? We will address this problem in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER THREE

MORPHOLOGY AND VOCABULARY OF THE TRIMETERS

In the previous chapter we argued that in terms of subject matter, Hipponax is different from his predecessors primarily because he abandons serious reflection and also because he infuses new energy and intensity into certain of the established thematic conventions of the trimeters, such as sex, invective, food and low-class status. His departure from the more contemplative and diverse thematography of the earlier trimeters and his concentration on a narrow range of characters who function in the particular social environment of the underclass find expression as well in the mode of presentation. In other words, the thematographical differences of Hipponax are reflected in the morphology of his language, vocabulary and narrative devices. The intention of this chapter is to show that:

a) The character of the first and second person moves from variable and inconsistent in Archilochus and Semonides to invariable and consistent in Hipponax (and Solon);

b) The subject of the verb (agent of action) in the third person, frequently impersonal and generalized in Archilochus and even more so in Semonides and Solon, is almost always specific in Hipponax;

c) The intensity with which the persons of the verb are used shifts noticeably: while in earlier times the "I" and "you" are the major initiators of action, in Hipponax their use is reduced; in contrast, while the third person appears at moderate rates in the early period, in Hipponax its frequency rises dramatically;

d) The vocabulary also shifts: while in the early period verbs of feeling, attitude, perception and cognition appear at high rates, on occasion even surpassing those of verbs of physical action, in Hipponax the situation is reversed;

e) Similarly, while the first generation has higher percentages of nouns of "intangibles" (social or political condition, abstractions, mental entities and so on), Hipponax is highest in nouns of "tangibles" or "perceptibles," especially domestic artifacts.

I. Identity of Character

A. *The Speaker (First Person)*

Archilochus:
The first person singular appears in fourteen fragments. In seven of them (27, 28, 48, 58, 68, 73, 82) the text is unintelligible and the identity of the speaker indeterminate.[1] In the remaining fragments the speaker ("I"): a) expresses his indifference to wealth and political power, 19; b) contemplates the magnitude of the misfortunes of the Thasians, 20; c) defends himself against slander to a woman, 23; d) expresses his relief over a merchant's return from a sea-trip, 24; e) prides himself on good advice, 25; f) recounts a disagreement with Lycambes, 54; and g) claims that he knows a cure for a medical condition, 67.

The identity as well as the profession of the speaker in fr. 19 are provided by Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1418b28): he is Charon the carpenter. The tone of the speaker in fr. 24 (elation and relief over a young merchant's return) suggests that he belongs to a family involved in trade and commerce, or perhaps he is a partner in the commercial enterprise which dispatched the addressee to Gortyn. Medical vocabulary (].*τομῃι*, 1; *ἴησιν*, 5, perhaps also *λίνου*, 8) in fr. 67 suggests that the speaker is a physician. In fr. 25 the "I" claims to be a soothsayer (*μάντις*, 5).[2]

In fr. 23 the speaker addresses a mysterious female ruler, defending himself against unflattering rumors. The poem has been interpreted as an erotic one, the various military references charged with sexual allusions; but there are difficulties with such an approach, which have been pointed out.[3] The setting genuinely seems to be oriental, and the speaker, a man who holds office or is in a position of responsibility (*ἐμοί μελήσει*, 10). His speech is pervaded with pride over his social

[1] In fr. 58 a male sings to the accompaniment of the *aulos* (12), but it is not clear whether the participle *ἄιδων* refers to the first person or another, although the former is more likely: *αμαι*] (4) and *ἐμεωυτο*[(11) point toward a speaker-symposiast (there are no forms in the fragment indicating any other person).

[2] Later sources do inform us that Archilochus mentions soothsayers (cf. Batousiades, fr. 182; also fr. 183).

[3] See Slings 1987: 5 ff.

status and high birth: *ἀνήρ τοι δειλὸς ἆρ' ἐφαινόμην, / οὐδ' οἷός εἰμ' ἐγὼ οὗτος οὐδ' οἵων ἄπο*, 12-3.[4]

Fr. 20 has been preserved by five different authors and none of them makes any allusion to a named character, as is the case with fr. 19. In addition, most of the quoting sources (Strabo and Athenaeus, among them) point out that Archilochus speaks of the Magnesians, as does Callinus. The fact that the views of the poem are attributed to "Archilochus" suggests that the words here are spoken by an "I" that frequently is confused with the poet himself. This "I," however, in essence serves as the voice of the community, since everybody in the audience is able to identify with the speaker of the poem. In this example, he looks with sympathy upon someone else's misfortunes and contemplates the mutability of human prosperity.[5]

In fr. 54 there must be a dispute between the speaker and Lycambes, with some obscene references and threats to one of his daughters. The "I" of the poem (and also of the Lycambes cycle as a whole) certainly does not indicate a named character, for the ancient tradition is unanimous in assuming that the hostility described in the poems is between Lycambes and Archilochus the poet. Whether the "I" truly represents Archilochus himself and the events described are historical or fictitious are two vexing questions in the study of archaic iambus,[6]

---

[4] For the identification of *δειλός* with *κακός* (low-born) cf. Thgn. 57-8; 101-2; 105-9; 161-3; Sol. 13.39. For the association of loyalty to one's friends with the aristocratic code of honor, see Thgn. 529-30. Cf. Slings 1987: 8-9. In this light, statements like *ἐπίσταμαι τοι...τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἐχθαίρειν* (23.14-5) and *ἓν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα / τὸν κακῶς ⟨μ'⟩ ἔρδοντα ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς* (126), should be understood not merely as generic expressions of iambic invective, but more precisely as referring to the aristocratic principle of identifying with the group's interests, in terms of both loyalties and animosities.

[5] Dover's 1963: 208-12 admonition about "hidden" characters should not worry us here. Indeed in a small community no names need to be named when the content makes it clear who the speaker is; in cases like that of fr. 20, however, the identity of the particular "I" is almost irrelevant.

[6] The possibilities for the Lycambes saga range from being a complete fiction, to being historical, to blending fiction and truth in various combinations. Scholars have argued one way or another, but eventually to insist upon identifying every "I" as fictional or biographical may do a disservice to our understanding of the complexities of Greek lyric. In addition, different meters, length, etc., may create a different set of expectations from the audience regarding veracity, cf. Rösler 1985: 131-44, and more recently on the same lines Bowie 1993: 36. See also Irwin's 1998: 177-83 rejection of the terms of the standard debate and her attractive attempt to synthesize what we know from the biographical tradition with the poetry itself, thus furthering our insights "both into how the poet can exploit genre and tradition in the service of an

but irrelevant here. The profession and social status of Lycambes' nemesis remain obscure, not only in fr. 54, but in all fragments treating of the famous feud.[7]

The first person plural appears in three fragments, indicating: a) a group of people praying for the destruction of their enemies, 26; b) members of a group offering their services, but not without payment, 34; c) the members of a family or household, 35.

In frr. 26 and 34, the identity of "we" is obscure, but it has been suggested plausibly that in the latter the first person plural may signify Nessus and his centaurs negotiating the passage of Deianeira. Fr. 35 seems to come from a fable, in which case the characters are animals.

Semonides:

The "I" appears in six fragments. The speaker: a) states that if men took his advice they would not pursue the wrong things in life, 1.22; b) asks why it took him so long to recount his story, 10; c) says that she anointed herself with perfumes, 16; d) recounts a sexual encounter, 17; e) points out that he has brought some cheese, 23; f) claims knowledge of the art of sacrificing, 24.

In the poems of a contemplative character, the "I" appears only once (1.22), not necessarily signifying the poet alone but rather personifying reason, the voice of common sense: life is painful in itself, therefore ("pay attention to me," *εἰ δ' ἐμοὶ πιθοίατο*) we should not make things worse. The identities of the speakers in frr. 10, 17, and 23 remain obscure (the latter was able to travel in some capacity: a merchant?). In fr. 24, the speaker is a cook, and in fr. 16, although the gender is not identified in the text, probably a prostitute, as has been suggested above.[8]

The first person plural occurs in five fragments: a) we should not pursue evil things, 1.23; b) we should not think of death, 2; c) for us

---

aim…and into what the conception of the power of invective…was for the archaic poet and his society." Cf. Nagy 1990: 9 and 1994/5: 20-1 on the "generic I" in the context of genre "as a formal device to recapture the authoritative occasion."

[7] Stehle 1997: 242 suggests credibly that *ὅρκον δ' ἐνοσφίσθης μέγαν / ἅλας τε καὶ τράπεζαν* (fr. 173) alludes to eating together, "precisely the tie enacted in the symposium," in which case both the "I" of the poem and Lycambes share a similar social status, that of the aristocracy. The Mnesiepes inscription refers to Lycambes as a person of prominence: if its information is historical, Lycambes was in fact an aristocrat; if it derives from the poetry of Archilochus, he must have been presented therein as such.

[8] See *Sexual Themes* in Semonides in the previous chapter.

mortals, life is short but death long, 3; d) we males do not know that all wives are similar (i.e., bad), 7.114; e) a dung beetle has flown to us, 13. With the exception of fr. 13, in which the first person plural seems to signify characters in an animal fable, the rest of the "we"s are impersonal. In the heavily generalizing atmosphere of the reflective fragments of Semonides, the first person plural signifies consistently either the human race as a whole or a large portion of it (i.e., males).

Solon:
The speaker depicts himself as: a) a mediator and law-giver who brings justice and social order to Athens, 36; b) a mark (*ὅρος*) placed between the two opposing camps, 37.9-10.

The "I" here signifies Solon himself. His poetry is historical and autobiographical and is used as a weapon in the political arena of Athens. In the trochaic fr. 33.1 the poet puts a direct speech into the mouth of his enemies in which he is identified by name: *οὐκ ἔφυ Σόλων βαθύφρων οὐδὲ βουλήεις ἀνήρ* (because he did not take advantage of his position). In the trimeter fr. 37.6-8 we find the same theme, but now from Solon's own point of view: (*εἰ γάρ τις ἄλλος, φησί, ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς ἔτυχεν*) *οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον, οὐδ' ἐπαύσατο / πρὶν ἀνταράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα.* Solon's corpus of trimeters contains no occurrences of the first person plural.

Hipponax:
The "I" occurs in eighteen fragments. The speaker: a) prays or complains to a god, 3a, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40;[9] b) is the sexual partner of Arete, 16, 17, and of an unidentified female, 84, 92, 104; c) complains about being the subject of abuse, 41, 73; d) passes personal judgment, 30; e) tries to sell something, 44; f) is Plutus addressing Hipponax, 36.

The "I" in Hipponax reflects a remarkable consistency of character. The speaker belongs to a very low social stratum, is involved in schemes, and is constantly in a state of deprivation, lacking clothes, food, and money.[10] But who is this speaker? We know that at least in

[9] Although no god is named in fr. 34, its adjacent location to a prayer to Hermes (fr. 32) in Tzetzes, our quoting source, makes it very probable that this too may come from the same poem. Content and language suggest that fr. 39 is also a prayer.

[10] For the poverty and social marginalization of the poet, see also Acosta-Hughes 2002: 227-8.

certain poems the first person signifies "Hipponax," for the poet uses his own name as a character in his poetry:[11] in fr. 32 he abruptly changes the first person into third: *ῥιγῶ καὶ βαμβαλύζω...δὸς χλαῖναν Ἱππώνακτι*; fr. 36: *ἐμοὶ δὲ Πλοῦτος...ἐλθὼν οὐδάμ' εἶπεν* "*Ἱππῶναξ...*" The fact that certain characters are treated by the speaker consistently with the same disposition also suggests that the latter is the same character each time. It is reasonable to assume that the "I" threatening Bupalus in fr. 84 signifies the same character who abuses him elsewhere (for instance, frr. 1, 77, 95a), especially when connections between the two can be made through Arete (frr. 12, 15?).

The absence of incompatible elements among the characters who speak in the first person, and in fact their strong similarities, suggest that most of the "I"s signify a single identity ("Hipponax"). Although there is evidence of characters other than "Hipponax" using direct speech,[12] their speeches are, as far as we can tell, always very short.

---

[11] "Hipponax" should not be confused with Hipponax, however. In the past the poet has been described, among other ways, as moralistic, democratic, proletarian, plebeian, beggar, noble but decadent, "beat" and "angry," cf. Degani 1984: 119 ff. and Hughes 1996: 205. But the status of the archaic poets is aristocratic. The symposium is a setting in which the discourse marks a distinction between the participating aristocrats and the community at large, cf. Donlan 1985: 237-9; Stehle 1997: 216. Archilochus (fr. 14), Mimnermus (fr. 7), and Theognis (795-6) all declare that the censure of the common people brings no enjoyment (and therefore should be ignored). See also Solon's fr. 15, which, with its distinction between *ἀγαθοί* and *κακοί* and its preference of the permanent quality of *ἀρετή* over the unpredictable state of *πλοῦτος* and *χρήματα*, reveals an aristocratic ideology (the lines are identical to Thgn. 315-8; cf. Melissano 1994: 49-58 and Duplouy 1999: 1-22). Semonides' address to a *παῖς* (fr. 1.1) also sets the parameters of the sympotic/pederastic environment, which is clearly aristocratic, cf. its frequent use in Theognis. In fr. 115 Hipponax releases his venom against a former *ἑταῖρος* who betrayed his oath to the group and now has been isolated. There are other hints that indicate the poet's aristocratic status, such as his name (*ἵπποι* and *ἄναξ*), which would have hardly been given to a beggar. Cf. also *Suda* (ii.665.16 Adler), who refers to him as *γενναῖος*, virtually equivalent to "high-born," and as "banished by the tyrants" of Ephesus (*ὑπὸ τῶν τυράννων...ἐξελασθείς*), cf. Degani 1984: 24-5. West 1974: 28 points out the highly skillful and sophisticated style of Hipponax in the service of the persona of a buffoon that the poet adopts. But such a character is less effective in embarrassing his opponents, in that by his self-abasement he undermines his own legitimacy (cf. Solon's device in fr. 34). The fact that he indeed drags his opponents down to his level hardly provides any kind of leverage. Despite the abundance of invective and aggression throughout Hipponax's poetry, his primary intention is probably the entertainment of his audience rather than abuse in the manner of Archilochus; so also Bowie 2001: 11.

[12] See the two individuals cursing each other "*ἀπό σ' ὀλέσειεν Ἄρτεμις.*" – "*σὲ δὲ κὠπόλλων,*" fr. 25; the direct quotation (in Lydian) of the female in fr. 92.1 ("*βασκ...κρολεα*"); Plutus addressing Hipponax in fr. 36.

We may conclude, then, that the poet reserves the privilege of first person statements or narratives primarily to his adopted persona.
In contrast to this use of the first person singular, "we" appears in just one fragment (84), signifying the speaker and his partner during intercourse. This single occurrence depicts a temporary physical union rather than a deeper and more stable relationship (for instance, friendship, membership in a political club) and is perhaps an eloquent testimony to Hipponax's poetic world, where there is no space for sincere alliances and true fellowship.

By way of summary of the uses of the first person throughout the archaic period, we may note the following: In the first generation the "I" reflects a wide range of characters. In Archilochus and Semonides, the first person may be gnomic, revealing nothing about the identity of the speaker and rather standing as the voice of accumulated wisdom or collective sentiment. But the first person in Archilochus and Semonides also signifies specific individuals, as indicated by the speakers whose profession is carpenter, physician, soothsayer, cook, merchant, prostitute and even office-holder. Solon is easier to assess: in frr. 37 and 38 the "I" is autobiographical, that of a political figure who takes pride in and contemplates the social reforms that he has initiated in Athens. Solon's corpus of trimeters, however, is particularly small, even by the standards of archaic iambus, and in any case the first person appears only in two fragments of similar content, which, if we judge from frr. 38-40, may not be representative of his entire iambic corpus. In Hipponax, although we can rarely say what the profession of the speaker is (a thief, 3a; a huckster?, 44), there is a remarkable consistency in the presentation of character (activities, perception of the world, state of deprivation). It is very possible, as has been suggested above, that in most cases the "I" presents the same character, "Hipponax," although we should allow for exceptions. The difference, then, in the depiction of the first person between Archilochus and Semonides on the one hand, and Hipponax on the other, is remarkable: while the former contain a variety of "I"s which range from aristocratic gnomic speakers and officers in exotic lands to artisans and prostitutes, in Hipponax the selection is much narrower, confined to the milieu of the underclass. While the "I" in the first generation is

variable, in Hipponax it is consistent, depicting either the same character or characters drawn from a narrow pool.[13]

Our understanding of the function of the first person plural is hindered even more than that of the "I" by the even greater paucity of references: in Archilochus, the three occurrences appear in fragments that seem to be direct invective (26), animal fable (35), and perhaps mythological story (34). In Semonides, of the five occurrences, four signify the human race (or males) as a whole and one, animal characters in a fable (13). The only occurrence of "we" in Hipponax signifies the speaker and his sexual partner. Again, from this (admittedly limited) amount of data we may postulate that in the first generation, "we" is variable, as is the "I," while the only occurrence in Hipponax conforms to the narrowness of his character depiction.

B. *The Addressee (Second Person)*

Archilochus:

The second person singular appears in thirteen fragments. In five of them, the poor condition of the text renders the identification of the addressee either problematic or impossible.[14] In the remaining fragments, the "you" signifies: a) a female ruler before whom the speaker defends himself, 23; b) a young merchant who manages to return safe after a long trip on a small ship, 24; c) Apollo, asked to punish the speakers' foes, 26; d) the interlocutor of one who negotiates the price for a ride, 34; e) Glaucus, 48; f) an enemy accused of being a thief, 49; g) Lycambes, as the recipient of invective, 54; h) a physician's patient, 67.

---

[13] Contrast Depew 1992: 322: "Archilochus may complain about poverty or his trials as a mercenary soldier, but for the purposes of iambus Hipponax, a poet hypersensitive to lectional and stylistic nuance, skillfully adopts an enormously wide variety of personae and characteristically speaks to any number of equally disreputable 'hearers.'" But the variety of personae in the poetry of Hipponax represents a very confined social underclass that is not comparable to the character diversity encountered in Archilochus and Semonides. Hipponax is devoid of statements of value on more general issues, focusing instead on observations *ad hominem*. One could argue that the first generation of the iambic poets offers us a closer (although not necessarily autobiographical) view of the world through their more inclusive thematography; Hipponax, on the other hand, is primarily an entertainer, who becomes almost a comic anti-hero; see also Slings 1990: 20. For the relationship between composition, narrative, and their shaping of the persona that acts and speaks within, see Nagy 1979: 247.

[14] Frr. 25; 27; *Περίκ*]*λεες*, 28.4 (Peek);]*λαντίδη*, 29.6;]*θενειάδη*[, 82.11.

The identity of the mysterious female addressee in fr. 23 has attracted considerable scholarly attention: it has been suggested that she may be a despot of the Near East (Treu, Kamerbeek, Slings), the wife of a man called *Μύρμηξ* (Peek), the mistress of the poet (Adrados), Neoboule (Lasserre), or a male whose sexual preferences cause the derisive address *γύναι* (Page, Latte).[15] The suggestion of an Eastern potentate appears the most attractive, although perhaps not the wife of Candaules, as suggested by Clay,[16] since the story of that personage, at least as we know it from Herodotus (1.8-12), does not mention a queen of the Amazon type such as the one depicted here (*σὺ δὲ / νῦν εἷλες αἰχμῆι καὶ μέγ᾽ ἐξήρω κλέος*, 19-20). In fr. 34, if Schneidenwin is correct that the speaker is Nessus the centaur, the addressee is Deianeira, offered passage across the River Euenus. The addressee of fr. 48 is Glaucus, one of the military companions of the poet, who appears also in the elegies (15) and the tetrameters (96, 105, 131). Fr. 48 is poorly preserved, but the two almost complete lines that immediately precede his name praise the perfumed hair and breasts of some females, thus suggesting that the context may be sympotic.[17] Glaucus is presented here in a different light from that of fr. 15: while in the elegies he is the recipient of sober gnomic advice, in fr. 48 he is depicted with a more lighthearted attitude and in a setting of entertainment.[18]

The trimeters of Archilochus contain no second person plural forms.

Semonides:

There are three occurrences of the second person singular: a *παῖς*, 1; unidentified male, chastised for his unkempt appearance, 10a; Telembrotus, being complimented perhaps on his banquet preparations, 22.

Fr. 1 is an address to an *eromenos*, and thus the poem is classifiable as pederastic in the wider sense, which, as is frequently the case in elegy as well, concentrates on gnomic and philosophical advice rather than on erotic confessions.

---

[15] For a detailed bibliography, see Burnett 1983: 70-1. See also Bowie 1993: 39n.31.

[16] Clay 1986: 7-17.

[17] For the use of perfumes at the symposium, cf. Alcaeus frr. 50 and 362 P.

[18] The reference to Glaucus in the trochaic fr. 117 reveals levity, and thus a setting other than military, perhaps similar to that of fr. 48.

In Semonides there are no occurrences of the second person plural.

Solon:
There are no occurrences of the second person singular or plural.

Hipponax:
The second person singular appears in seventeen fragments: the addressee is: a god (Hermes, 3a, 32, 35; Zeus, 38; unidentified, 34, 39; Malis-Athena, 40); target of invective, 15, 19, 25 (twice), 28, 52; "Hipponax," 36; the interlocutor of a merchant or huckster, 44; worshiper of Hermes, 47; Athenis, 70.[19]

The second person plural appears only once, signifying the citizens of Clazomenae, who are informed that Bupalus is a murderer, 1.

In sum, in the generation of Archilochus and Semonides, the second person is inclusive and diverse, the addressees encompassing a range from a god and perhaps a mythological character to a female ruler of exotic lands, beloved relative or associate, patient, thief, friend, enemy, and *eromenos*. In Hipponax, on the other hand, "you" signifies a narrower range of characters, the addressee being typically either a god or the target of abuse. The second person, then, presents us with a trajectory similar to that of the first person, since both of them move away from a variable use and toward a more restricted one.

[19] Athenis, according to the tradition (e.g., Plin. *NH* 36.4.11, Suda, ii 665.16 Adler), is the brother of Bupalus and like him a sculptor and much abused by the poet; but in the extant corpus his name appears only once, in fr. 70, with no context. During the centuries, Bupalus and Athenis gained a status similar to that of Lycambes and his daughters, in the sense that the feud between the character "Hipponax" on the one hand, and Bupalus and Athenis on the other came to be understood as a feud between Hipponax the poet and the two brothers. For Hipponax as an art critic and aesthete, see Acosta-Hughes 2002: 32-5. The extant trimeters, however, depict Bupalus as a competitor in love; there are no lines suggesting that the poet's animosity is triggered by an unflattering image/statue of him created by the two brothers. Hipponax, by implicating Bupalus in sexual situations, appears to exploit the fact that his name can be read as a play on the elements *βου-* (bull) and *-παλός* (= *φαλλός*), as Rosen 1988c: 29-41 has suggested. This type of invective in Hipponax is reminiscent of that in Archilochus, where an enemy is abused on account of his large penis, fr. 43.

C. *Characters Other than Speaker and Addressee*

In addition to the "I" and "you," there is a large number of characters who appear in what we might call the "third person mode," primarily as the subject and object of the verb, but also in other more oblique syntactical functions. This section concentrates on these figures who complete the cast of characters in the trimeters[20] and whose interaction with the speaker or his interlocutor becomes increasingly important with the passing of time.

Archilochus:
Characters other than the speaker and the addressee appear in the singular twenty-two times referring to eight females and fourteen males. *Females*: a hetaera who is holding flowers, 30; a hetaera with lush hair, 31; a prostitute performing a sexual act, 42; a daughter of Lycambes, 38, 54.5, 57.9; a procuress (?) who brings her associates to an event, perhaps a drinking party, 48.5; a particular woman, 49.4. *Males*: a friend, 23.14; an enemy, 23.15; a man, 24.11, 25.1, 25.2, 60.6; a soothsayer, 25.5; Phalangius the cowherd, 25; an old man, 48.6; Gyges, 19.1; Melesander, 25.3; Arthmiades, 29.3; Lycambes, 38, 57.

In the plural, there are eight occurrences. *Females*: certain maidens fighting off intruders, 47. *Males*: unspecified men, 23.8, 23.18, 23.21, 29.5; spear-bearers, 24.13; the speaker's enemies, 26; men performing a sexual act, 45.

Of the nine occurrences of females (eight in the singular and one in the plural) seven are in the nominative case.[21] All of the females are specific. On the other hand, of the fourteen male characters appearing in the singular, eight are abstract and only six specific, all of them named individuals. Similarly in the plural, of the seven occurrences of males, five are abstract: *ἀνθρώπων*, 23.8, 29.5; *ἄνδρες*, 23.18; *πολλοῖσι*, 23.21; *αἰχμητέων*, 24.13, and only two specific: *τοὺς μὲν αἰτίους πήμαινε*, 26; and *κύψαντες ὕβριν ἀθρόην ἀπέφλυσαν*, 45. Thus of a total of twenty-one male characters (singular and plural), thirteen are abstract and eight specific. Also of the twenty-one male characters, only six appear in the nominative case; of these five are abstract: *οὗτοι*

[20] Gods and mythological figures excluded.
[21] The only female characters who do not appear in the nominative are those of frr. 31 (*ἡ δέ οἱ κόμη*) and 38 (*Λυκάμβεω παῖδα*).

ποτ' ἄνδρες, 23.18; *ἄλλος ἄλλῳ ἰένεται*, 25.2; *οὔτις ἄλλος μάντις*, 25.5; *ὡς ἂν καὶ γέρων ἠράσατο*, 48.6; *τρισμακάριος ὅστις*, 60.6. Recapitulating, then, we may observe: a) when females appear in the trimeters of Archilochus in a function other than that of the speaker or the addressee, they are very likely to be the subject of the verb, that is, the agents of action: seven-ninths of the women mentioned are found in the nominative case; by contrast, the respective rate of males in the nominative is dramatically lower (less than one third). b) When a male is the subject of the verb, it is most likely that the subject is used abstractly rather than signifying a particular individual; while with female characters the situation is again reversed, since all of them are particular individuals. These two points suggest that specific male characters initiate action not in the "third person mode" but when appearing in other roles, namely in the first and second persons: all seven occurrences of "I" signify males; five of the six human "you"s are also male. There is only one female addressee, the ruler in fr. 23, but, interestingly, she is quite different from the others in that she is a leader of armies and a conqueror, not a hetaera, prostitute or even a *παρθένος*. She is addressed, moreover, by a *persona loquens*.[22] Archilochus exhibits an inclination to generate action (and interaction) among male characters through addresses rather than through references in the third person, as is the case with the females. A masculine subject of the verb in the third person is in most cases an abstraction.

Semonides:

The bulk of his extant corpus consists of fragments of abstract meditations on human existence or observations on the nature of woman, and thus the overwhelming majority of characters are impersonal, signifying man as a species or men and women as representations of their genders. The few occurrences of specific individuals are confined to frr. 8-30. Particular references to characters other than the speaker and the addressee appear as following: *Singular*: man (abstract): 2.1, 4.1, 6.1, 7.16, 7.17, 7.22, 7.62, 7.77, 7.80, 7.83, 7.103, 7.110, 7.111, 7.112, 7.113 (twice), 14.1, 25; woman (abstract): 6.1, 7.1, 7.2, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 7.10, 7.12, 7.13, 7.15 (twice), 7.16, 7.19, 7.20, 7.21, 7.23, 7.24, 7.26,

[22] One should not conclude, however, that ordinary females are not addressed at all, since the Cologne Epode (196a) makes it clear that they are in fact addressed; yet there seems to be a predilection in Archilochus for addresses to males. In the Cologne Epode, as in fr. 23, there is (framed) dialogue, in which the characters address each other.

7.27 (twice), 7.28 (twice), 7.29, 7.30, 7.31, 7.33, 7.36, 7.38, 7.39, 7.41, 7.43, 7.44, 7.45, 7.46, 7.49, 7.50, 7.51, 7.53, 7.54 (twice), 7.55 (twice), 7.56, 7.57, 7.58, 7.59, 7.60 (twice), 7.62 (twice), 7.63, 7.64, 7.65, 7.67, 7.68, 7.71, 7.74, 7.75, 7.77, 7.79 (twice), 7.80, 7.81, 7.82, 7.83 (twice), 7.84, 7.85, 7.87, 7.88, 7.90, 7.100, 7.105, 7.106, 7.108, 7.109, 7.113 (twice), 7.118; a tyrant/king: 7.69; a guest: 7.29, 7.107; a sexual partner: 7.49; a specific merchant: 16.2; a specific (?) male: 18, 19. In fr. 26 the subject is missing, although the context suggests that it is a specific character.

Plural: men (abstract): 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8 (twice), 1.9, 1.12, 1.13, 1.15, 1.18, 1.21, 7.31, 7.95; women (abstract): 7.91, 7.92, 7.97 (twice); unspecified neighbors: 7.110.

Of the poetry of Semonides we notice that: a) outside the contemplative and generalizing poems, no female appears in the "third person mode;" b) markedly unlike the poetry of Archilochus, all (specific) male characters appear in the nominative case; and c) statistically, the third person dominates, but this is inflated by the fact that the repetitive narrative pattern of the very long fr. 7 employs the third person almost exclusively.[23]

Solon:

The poet's interests lie in issues affecting whole classes of people rather than specific individuals, hence his references are inclusive and generalizing. Characters other than the speaker (addressees are absent) appear in the singular four times, always as abstractions: a citizen: *κέντρον δ' ἄλλος...λαβών*, 36.20; *(ἄλλος) οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον*, 37.7; a man (twice): 40 (*ἄλλος, ἕτερος*). In frr. 36-7 the "he"s are found in conditional clauses and are used in the juxtaposition of the poet with his political opponents. In fr. 40, the stress is clearly on the culinary activity, not on the person (*ἄλλος, ἕτερος*) who performs it.

The occurrences in the plural present a similar situation. The thirteen references depict whole classes of people within Athenian society and signify: the Athenians who have been brought back to their country, 36.8-9; the Athenians enslaved on account of their financial burdens, 36.13-4; the masters who terrorized the people, 36.14; the political adversaries of Solon, 36.23; a political party/group of interests, 36.24; the people of the *demos*, 36.25, 37.3; the more powerful among the Athenians, 37.4; people belonging to different factions, 37.9; sym-

[23] See discussion below in the section "The Use of Person."

posiasts enjoying delicacies, 38.2; men in general, 38.4; people bringing a mortar, silphium, and vinegar, 39.

Hipponax:
References to characters other than the speaker and the addressee appear fifty-one times, referring to both males and females.

Males: Bupalus, 1, 12.2, 15, 77.4?, 84.18, 95.3, 95.4, 95.15, 95a; Cicon, 4.1, 4a, 78.7, 102.17; an enemy treated as *φαρμακός*, 6, 7, 10; the slave who broke the *κύλιξ*, 13.2; the drinking companion of Arete, 14.2; a man who spent all his inheritance on luxury, 26; a man devouring a variety of dishes, 26a; the captain of a ship, 28.3, 28.5; Critias the Chian, 30; "Hipponax," 32; a man, 43; the son of Asopodorus, 49; someone who: applies wax on the ship's keel, 51; pierces a lid with a pipe (perhaps sexual), 56; sits close to the fire, 59; lies naked on the bed, 62; is accused of intercourse with his mother, 70.7; gets into a fight with the speaker, 73.8; dines on mulberries, 78.4; steals a dog, 79.10; swindles, 79.18; sweeps the floor, 79.19; steals, 102.12; gets beaten, 104.12; is called "debauched," 105.10; plucks someone else's anus, 114a.[24]

Females: Arete, 12.2, 14.2, 16.1, 17; one (*αὐτῇι*) in whose house there is no *κύλιξ* (Arete?), 13.1; midwife (*ὀμφαλητόμος*), in an abusive address to a foe, 19.1; female dressed in a "Coraxian" mantle (*Κοραξικὸν λῶπος*), apparently referring to "*une femme impudique*,"[25] 2; a woman picking her nose (context perhaps sexual), 22; the mother of an enemy in a sexual context, 70.8; the speaker's sexual partner, 84.15; female thrashing the speaker with a fig branch, 92.1; prostitute, 104.34.

Characters in the plural form appear twelve times: a group of men treating another group (Bupalus and Athenis?) as *φαρμακοί*, 9; the sons of Erythreans tricked by Bupalus, 12; some individuals drinking (Bupalus and Arete?), 13; Arete and a male companion drinking, 14; some particular men, 23; the citizens of an unidentified city who sell

[24] The person of the verb is indeterminate in a number of fragments. Someone contemplates beating someone with a stick, 20; is about to teach something, 77; and evacuates frequently during the meal to make space for more food, 114c. Gender uncertain (subject missing): someone who invokes Hermes, 3; pecks someone's penis, 21; gives orders to stone "Hipponax," 37; is threatening the speaker, 41; lives in a certain section of Smyrna, 50; croaks like a bird in feces, 61; eats like a dog, 66; coughs, 82.

[25] Masson 1962: 102-3.

their captives, 27; the captive barbarians who are sold, 27; some men prattling at each other, 53; a group of people wearing garlands, 60; a group of men hastening from the stern of a ship to the sea, 65; drunken people, 67; the three witnesses that go to a tavern, 79.

Hipponax focuses on specificity, on the activities of particular characters depicted in detail, while avoiding general observations and inferences. There are indeed a few abstract uses of "he/she" and "they," but they represent only a very small fraction of all references and are too short to be deciphered in terms of subject matter. One of them, fr. 67, seems to come from an invective poem, since heavy drinking is a *topos* in the discourse of abuse (cf. Archilochus frr. 42 and 124). Fr. 43 (*μάκαρ ὅτις ⟨ ⟩ θηρεύει †πρήσας*) is hard to assess and so is fr. 27, which refers to capture and sale into slavery of foreigners. In syntactical terms, Hipponax's cast of characters functions independently of their gender: women initiate and receive action as often as their male counterparts.

To summarize this section we may observe the following: as the trimeters stand, characters other than the speaker and the addressee present us with a shift from a more abstract to a more concrete depiction over time. In Archilochus, in the infrequent cases in which the subject of the third person verb is a male, it is often impersonal; in the cases in which it signifies particular individuals, the context seems to be either abusive or sexual. In contrast, most of the females (always specific) appear as the subject of the verb. In Semonides the third person is even more abstract, denoting in the majority of cases either the human race in general or large segments of it. In Solon the third person signifies the Athenian people as a whole or social classes rather than particular individuals. In Hipponax, on the other hand, the various "he/she"s or "they"s refer overwhelmingly to particular individuals and are only rarely used in a more abstract and generalizing way.

II. The Use of Person

The intention here is to show that while in Archilochus, Semonides, and Solon it is the first person that is the main agent of action, in Hipponax it is chiefly the third person. Even recognizing the brevity of all four iambic poets' corpora, Semonides and Solon are particularly

challenging: in the former case, the bulk of his poetry is represented by a single fragment (7), the sheer size of which distorts any objective statistical profile; in the case of Solon, the corpus is especially small, a weakness intensified by the fact that all of the five fragments probably derive from just two poems. The focus, then, will fall on Archilochus and Hipponax, although at the end of the section Semonides and Solon will also be taken into account.

A. *Archilochus and Hipponax*

Very frequently in Hipponax and to a lesser degree in Archilochus, the trimeters tell a story or describe an episode. Yet they accomplish this in different ways: Archilochus provides the narrative through address to a specific individual. As a rule, the speaker and the addressee are also the main agents of action, in some cases the former initiating it and the latter receiving it; in other cases, the roles are reversed. Archilochus tends to use the third person sparingly. Hipponax, on the other hand, with his persistent employment of "he" and "she" elevates the third person to a dominant position. The distribution of the person of the verb in the two poets is as follows (see Appendix I for details):

	Archilochus	Hipponax
I	23 (35.0%)	17 (18%)
You Sing.	26 (39.5%)	10 (11%)
He/She	12 (18.0%)	53 (57%)
We	1 (1.5%)	3 (3%)
You Plural	–	–
They	4 (6.0%)	10 (11%)
TOTAL	66 [26]	93 [27]

The chart above indicates that in Hipponax the role of the first person (singular and plural) is dramatically reduced (21%) as compared to

[26] The total of "You Sing." contains also the incomplete verbs]ύξεαι, 27.5 and]ίζεαι, 27.10. Not included in the total of the third person are thirteen verbs classified as "Uncertain" and "Other," whose subject is either indeterminate or a god/mythological character or not a human (see below; included in Appendix I as separate categories).

[27] Similarly, as in Archilochus (see previous note) there are seventeen additional verbs in the third person classified as "Other" or "Uncertain."

Archilochus (36.5%). The same is true with much greater intensity of the rate of the second person: the rate of Archilochus is almost four times that of Hipponax. Archilochus emphasizes an interaction between the "I" and the "you," while Hipponax presents his characters not in the intimate light of this kind of relationship, but in the more objective third person. His preference is such that on occasion he even speaks of his own persona as "he" (*δὸς Ἱππώνακτι*, 32.4; *λεύειν Ἱππώνακτα*, 37; *ἐς Ἱππώνακτος*, 79.9). In Hipponax the main initiator of action is the third person, not the first or, much less, the second.

Of the thirteen addresses in Archilochus,[28] one is a prayer to Apollo (26); in the remaining twelve, the addressees are particular individuals. In nine of the twelve addresses we can also find an "I" (75%);[29] of the remaining three, one is particularly mutilated (29) and another contains a "we" (34). In other words, in Archilochus only a small fraction of fragments containing a "you" do not also contain the first person.

Of the twelve addresses to humans in Archilochus, only three appear to be invective, namely frr. 49, 54, and 82. Thus, if we set aside frr. 27 and 28, which are unintelligible, the total of abusive addresses represents approximately 30% of all addresses.

In Hipponax, of the seventeen[30] addresses, seven[31] are prayers to a god. Out of the remaining ten addresses (of which fr. 70 is unintelligible), as many as six (15, 19, 25 twice, 28, 52), are abusive. In one of the remaining three, "you" signifies "Hipponax" (addressed by Plutus, 36); in another fragment the speaker tries to sell something to the addressee (44); and in the third, someone is being given advice/directions to visit Hermes of the Phlyesians (47). Prayers and the mutilated fr. 70 excluded, abusive addresses in Hipponax represent as much as two thirds of all addresses. This rate is twice as high as that found in Archilochus.

It is perhaps noteworthy that in Hipponax only one (fr. 44)[32] of the nine intelligible addresses to humans also contains an "I," as opposed to the very high rate in Archilochus. A partial explanation for this difference may lie in the fact that the nature of the addresses is noticea-

---

[28] Frr. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 34, 48, 49, 54, 67, 82.
[29] Frr. 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 48, 54, 67, 82.
[30] Frr. 3a, 15, 19, 25 (twice), 28, 32, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 44, 47, 52, 70.
[31] Frr. 3a, 32, 34, 35, 38, 39, 40.
[32] Not counting fr. 36 in which the "I" signifies Plutus addressing Hipponax.

bly different in the two poets: in Archilochus, more often than not, the speaker is in a personal relationship with his addressee: officer/female ruler, 23; relative/relative or friend/friend, 24; soothsayer/client, 25; physician/patient, 67. In Hipponax, on the other hand, the largest portion of his addresses is abusive. A person can ridicule another member of his community for a number of reasons, even if he does not have a direct relationship with him: unusual appearance, a name with comic possibilities, commission of some stupidity, and so forth. More frequently, of course, invective is the result of hostility caused by personal friction. Yet in an abusive poem the causes of animosity are not always mentioned: the addressee is presented as foolish, ugly, incompetent, and so on, but not necessarily in connection with the speaker, especially since an attack can be more damaging if the target is portrayed as a laughing-stock in general. An example of this type of invective may be Hip. 28, which is probably a complete poem: Mimnes is abused on account of his erratic artwork. There is no mention of a personal motive; the artistic offense, however, soon gives place to an irrelevant accusation (homosexual debauchery), which again does not establish a connection with the speaker.[33] The difference in the intention of the addresses therefore may have a bearing on the great gap we observe between Archilochus and Hipponax concerning the appearance of the first person in each of their corpora.

B. *Semonides and Solon*

An examination of the person of the verb in Semonides and Solon reveals the following:

	Semonides	Solon
I	7 (6.0%)	12 (45%)
You Sing.	4 (3.5%)	–
He/She	86 (74.5%)	6 (22%)

[33] Invective of the type of fr. 28 appears in other poets as well: Semonides abuses his addressee in fr. 10a for his unkempt appearance (again, in the extant lines we do not find any indications of personal friction). Archilochus, in the admittedly mutilated fr. 49, one of the two addresses in the entire corpus which do not contain an "I," attacks the habits of an enemy without referring to the cause of his animosity towards him.

	Semonides	Solon
We	6 (5.0%)	–
You Plural	–	–
They	13 (11.0%)	9 (33%)
TOTAL	116 [34]	27 [35]

Seventy-six of the eighty-six "he/she"s and five of the thirteen "they"s in Semonides come from the 118-line fr. 7, a fact which creates two interrelated problems: first, the majority of Semonides' preserved lines come from a single poem; second, the structure of this poem is such that the third person is reiterated constantly, at almost the total expense of other persons. The end result is that the extant fragments do not provide a representative sampling of the entire corpus. In order to even the playing field and reduce fr. 7 to a weight more proportionate to that of the other fragments, let us imagine a situation in which only seven lines of it were preserved (the statistical average length of a fragment in Semonides), rather than one hundred and eighteen. We would expect the seven lines to contain approximately five occurrences of "he/she" and no occurrence of "they."[36] This new adjusted "corpus" would appear as following:

	Semonides (Selective Sampling)
I	7 (18%)
You Sing.	4 (10%)
He/She	15 (38%)
We	5 (13%)
You Plural	–
They	8 (21%)
TOTAL	39

Semonides would now contain a total of fifteen (10+5) "he/she"s out of a total of thirty-nine references to any person (38%) and eight "they"s (21%), which makes a total of 59% (as compared to 24% in Archilochus and 68% in Hipponax). Of importance here, however, is

[34] Plus twenty-three third person verbs classified as "Other" (included in Appendix I).

[35] Plus four third person verbs identified as "Other," as above.

[36] In fr. 7 the ratio of occurrence of "he/she" is 0.65 per line; "they" occurs .04 times per line; "we," .01 times.

the fact that Semonides makes intense use of the impersonal third person, which clearly differentiates him from Hipponax and brings him closer to Archilochus. The "I" would occur at a rate of 18%, while the "we," at the rate of 13%. Thus the total for the first person singular and plural is 31%, which is close to that of Archilochus (36.5%), and noticeably higher than that of Hipponax (21%). In the use of the second person, however, Semonides (10%) would be very close to Hipponax (11%). This selective sampling seems to reflect more realistically the entire corpus of Semonides.

The corpus of Solon as it stands is ambivalent: the high percentage of "I" (45%) is comparable to that of Archilochus (35%); on the other hand, the total of the third person singular and plural is 55%, a rate much higher than that of Archilochus but nonetheless lower than that of Hipponax (68%). We should also note that the third person occurrences are impersonal, which makes the distinction from Hipponax marked.

In short, there is good reason to believe that Hipponax is different from his predecessors in his choice of the person of the verb: while Archilochus, and, as it appears, Semonides, and perhaps Solon use the first person (singular and/or plural) with high frequency, Hipponax uses it sparingly; and while the earlier poets use the third person either at very low rates (Archilochus) or impersonally (Semonides and Solon), Hipponax establishes it as the major agent of action, almost always employing it with specificity.

III. The Use of Diction

A. *Verbs*

Another variable in which Hipponax is noticeably different from Archilochus, Semonides and also Solon is based on the use of verbs expressing feeling, attitude, perception or cognition on the one hand and physical action on the other. Although all four poets use verbs belonging to both categories, there is a pattern, a kind of progression, which culminates in the poetry of Hipponax: while the poets of the first generation and (to a smaller extent) Solon emphasize verbs of emotive or mental activity, Hipponax makes very limited use of them. On the

other hand, Hipponax contains a strikingly high rate of verbs of physical action.

The chart below indicates the particular frequencies (see Appendix II for details):

	Feeling/Cognition	Physical Action
Archilochus	26	19
Semonides	49	49
Solon	9	14
Hipponax	14	71

While in Archilochus for every verb of feeling/cognition correspond 0.7 verbs of physical action, in Semonides 1.0 and in Solon, 1.5, in Hipponax the rate is 5.1. Solon functions as a bridge between the first and third generations, although he is much closer to the former. In short, the chart above indicates that while in the early stages of archaic iambic the poets tend to emphasize the mental and emotional aspects of their characters and make them express their thoughts, perceptions, and attitudes, later on there is a shift towards presentation of physical action. This shift finds its ultimate expression in Hipponax.

B. *Nouns*

The interest of the earlier trimeters in expressing mental or emotive aspects and the subsequent shift toward exterior considerations are also reflected in the increasing intensity with which the physical environment and activities of the characters are presented. Hipponax is the master of detail: his descriptions are minute and colorful, from graphic sexual encounters to extensive lists of dishes to topographical details. Solon, too, may linger on the specific (cf. the long reference to dishes in frr. 38-40). In Archilochus and Semonides, on the other hand, the presentation of characters is more abstract, almost impressionistic, when compared to that of Hipponax.

Different degrees of shading in the depiction of the physical world are achieved not only through controlled use of verbs, but also nouns. Hipponax, for instance, has many fewer nouns that signify abstractions, political or social conditions, forces (natural, human, divine, and so on) and mental processes (all of them classified as "intangibles")

than the poets of the first generation. At the same time he contains a strikingly higher rate of "man-made" (artifactual and other) nouns.

The distribution of nouns in the trimeters is as follows (see Appendix III for details):

	Intangibles	Man-made	Natural	Physical Action
Archilochus	20	21	37	3
Semonides	69	41	65	5
Solon	19	16	4	-
Hipponax	13	113	71	2

The chart above indicates that in the first two generations the use of nouns signifying "intangibles" is quite prominent: in Archilochus, Semonides and Solon for every "intangible" noun correspond 1.0-0.6 "man-made." In Hipponax on the other hand, for every "intangible" correspond 8.8 "man-made," a rate which is eight and a half times higher than that of Archilochus and almost fifteen times higher than that of Semonides. Moreover, one can see differences between the first generation and Hipponax even where at first sight there appear to be similarities, for instance, when the poets use the same category of objects (not necessarily artifacts). Let us illustrate this point by briefly examining two variants, references to the human body and flowers, in the poetries of Archilochus and Hipponax. The former poet in a number of cases uses a part of the human body as a metonymy either for a person (19.4 and 24.13) or sexual preference (25.3). An important function of such references, however, seems to be their contribution in the presentation of a character: the grotesqueness (with strong allusions to crude foreignness) of an enemy is underlined by his oversized penis (43); the beauty of the hetaera in fr. 31, by her attractive hair. On occasion, a part of the body even expresses the entire essence of a moment, encapsulating a set of emotions: in fr. 48 the erotic attractiveness of the young females is compressed into the desirability of their perfumed hair and breasts.[37] Semonides functions in a similar way: the neatness of the "horse-woman," for instance, is expressed through her combed and adorned hair (7.65-6); the ugliness, both

[37] Cf. also Acosta-Hughes 2002: 280-1.

physical and metaphorical, of the "monkey-woman," through her short neck and lack of buttocks (7.75-6).

In Hipponax, on the other hand, references to the body can be roughly classified into two categories: private parts mentioned in sexual scenes (for instance, *διάσφαγμα*, *φαλέω*, *ὄρχις*), and parts of the body that tend to suffer injuries during violent confrontations (*ῥῖνα*, *γνάθος*, *ὀδόντες*, and so on). It is only rarely that the body is used figuratively, as in *ὤμειξε δ' αἷμα καὶ χολὴν ἐτίλησεν* (73.3), and even there the references signify physical violence.

In Archilochus, plants or flowers occur in two fragments, of which one has no context (*δίεξ τὸ μύρτον*, 32); the other depicts a female holding myrrh and roses (30), which, despite their perceptible sexual allusions, contribute to the creation of an attractive portrait. Although, as the fragment stands, we know nothing about the female (age, appearance), the speaker manages to infuse into his depiction of her a sense of youth, beauty, and playfulness, effects achieved in part through the verb *ἐτέρπετο*, but also through the floral imagery. While the adjective *καλόν* refers only to the flowers, we are somehow, almost subliminally, led to perceive it as also encompassing the person who is holding the flowers. In Hipponax, on the other hand, out of the eight plants or flowers mentioned, five are food-producing (*συκῆν*, *ἀμπέλου*, *κράμβη*, *πυρός*, twice), one is aromatic (*γληχών*) and the remaining two are the garlands of plum flowers and mint which some men are wearing. Again, as far as we can tell, the plants/flowers occur simply as objects in the flow of a story with no further literary use. Let these two examples suffice to indicate that there is a literalness in the functionality of things in Hipponax that is quite different from the frequently allusive language of Archilochus.

In closing our discussion of diction, we observe that, while in Archilochus and Semonides objects associated with daily activities represent a small fraction of all nouns and on occasion are even used in figurative speech, in Hipponax they are a conspicuous aspect of his poetry. The first and second generations of poets frequently depict physical reality only in vague outline, but Hipponax tends to present things very concretely. Archilochus and Semonides' interest in introspection is more effectively served by abstract nouns, while Hippo-

nax's fascination with the world we can see and touch is better expressed through pronounced use of artifactual nouns.[38]

To summarize, then, the entirety of Chapter Three, we have seen that:

a) While in Archilochus and Semonides the character of the first person is diverse, in Solon and Hipponax it becomes very consistent. In the corpora of the first two poets we encounter a variety of professions, attitudes, and preoccupations, which testify to the first generation's much more inclusive sense of thematography and character presentation. With Solon and Hipponax the "I" becomes predictable: the first person in Solon always signifies the political figure who defends and contemplates the social reforms in Athens; in Hipponax, it signifies speakers drawn from a very narrow repertory of characters belonging to the underclass and preoccupied with a limited set of themes. The second person functions along similar lines.

b) The subject of the verb in the third person is frequently impersonal in Archilochus and Semonides, and always in Solon, but almost never in Hipponax. The latter rarely resorts to abstractions, and when he does so the poems seem to be abusive, not serious reflection in the manner of Archilochus or Semonides. The poetic world of Hipponax is founded on the specificity of everyday life.

c) Over time there is a movement away from the first person as subject of the verb. While the "I" is the major agent of action in Archilochus and to a certain extent in Semonides (although in him the "we" is unusually pronounced), in Hipponax its significance is reduced, with Solon acting as a bridge. On the other hand, the third person becomes increasingly more frequent. The exaggerated rate of "he/she" in Semonides can be attributed to the unevenness of his extant corpus. While in Archilochus the first and second persons are the main agents and the third person is reduced in importance, in Hipponax the situation is exactly reversed.

d) The first generation employs rates of verbs expressing feeling, attitude, cognition and perception which are at equal levels and even

[38] The pattern that emerges in the depiction of the internal and external world, as outlined above by using the variants "intangibles" and "man-made," is not disturbed by the introduction of a third variant, "natural" (Tangible/Perceptible). In Archilochus for every "intangible" correspond three nouns depicting the tangible or perceptible world (man-made and natural); in Semonides, one and a half; in Solon, one. In Hipponax, however, the rate is more than fourteen; his interest lies clearly in the physical reality.

higher than those of verbs of physical action. Solon seems to function similarly, although in a less emphatic way. In contrast, in Hipponax the rate of verbs signifying emotion or mental activity is reduced drastically, while the frequency of verbs of physical action dramatically increases.

e) In Archilochus, Semonides and Solon the rates of occurrence of "intangibles" are much higher than that of Hipponax, while the ratio of "man-made" to "intangibles" in Hipponax is eight and a half (Archilochus) to fifteen (Semonides) times higher than those of the first generation. Solon is similar to his predecessors in this respect.

In short, while Archilochus and Semonides use the first person extensively, present a variety of characters in diverse situations, use impersonal subjects of the verb in the third person, contain high percentages of verbs of cognition and feeling as well as of "intangible" nouns, Hipponax (with Solon somewhere in between) presents the opposite picture: his subjects and characters are consistent and very narrow in range; he makes extensive use of the third person, almost never impersonal; avoids abstractions; and heavily favors artifacts.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE TRIMETERS AND ELEGY

This chapter compares the trimeters to elegy and argues that while in the early period the two genres overlap extensively in subject matter, later, by the time of Hipponax, they have little in common. This divergence is because the later poet's thematic scope becomes very limited, resulting in the exclusion of themes that in earlier times were shared with elegy. The similarities between elegy and the early trimeters extend also to other aspects besides themes, since in both the first person often depicts a gnomic speaker who comments or advises on issues of moral, social, or philosophical importance; the first and second persons signify a diverse range of characters; and the third person is often impersonal. The chapter argues, moreover, that there are parallels between elegy and the early trimeters regarding the frequency with which the particular persons of the verb occur and also the traits of diction (verbs of mental and emotive activity versus physical activity, and "intangible" nouns versus "man-made").

By "elegy" here we mean the six archaic elegiac poets whose dates cover approximately the same period as that of the iambic poets under consideration (from the mid-seventh to the final third of the sixth centuries). Archilochus and Solon survive in elegy as well as iambus. The remaining poets are Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus and Theognis. As in the case of the trimeters, we may distinguish approximately three generations of elegiac poets,[1] although their poetries here will be examined without chronological distinction, especially since they do not present us with such a drastic evolution as the trimeters. Theognis'

[1] Callinus and Tyrtaeus are contemporaries of Archilochus, all three forming the first generation (middle of the seventh century). Mimnermus (late seventh century) and Solon (seventh/sixth centuries) form the second; Theognis (mid/last third of the sixth century) can be understood as representing the last generation. The majority of scholars accept the middle of the sixth century or slightly later as the date for Theognis, with the notable exception of West 1974: 65 ff., especially 70, who believes that the picture that emerges from his poetry is closer to the political realities of Megara in the late seventh century.

extant poetry (*Theognidea*) is a compilation of poems on occasion quite diverse in content and obviously coming from different sources, but it is generally accepted as representing a sample of elegiac poetry performed in aristocratic circles between the late seventh and early fifth centuries. West[2] has argued cogently for the single authorship of ll. 27-236 because they present a well-arranged corpus without major gaps in their transition from one theme to another, and with a range of topics more focused than in the remainder of the collection.

I. Thematic Elements

A. *Elegy*

1. *Food/Eating*

Archilochus:

In fr. 2 the speaker states that his bread is hanging from his spear (*ἐν δορὶ μέν μοι μᾶζα μεμαγμένη*), an expression that has generated a considerable amount of scholarship.[3] Additionally, in the first mutilated lines of fr. 4 we can still read *δεῖπνον*, 4, but the immediate context is missing. The fragment has as its theme the drinking of a group of soldiers on nightwatch, and it seems that the mention of the dinner occurs in passing, perhaps even in a negative form (note *δ' ου*[, 4; *οὔτ' ἐμοὶ ὡσαι*[, 5), for instance, "although we have had little or no dinner, let us drink."[4]

Theognis:

In l. 33 the speaker advises Cyrnus to avoid the low-born and concentrate instead on pursuing the company of aristocrats, drinking and eating (*ἔσθιε*) with them, among other things; a similar thought is expressed in l. 563 (*κεκλῆσθαι δ' ἐς δαῖτα*). In l. 115 the speaker states that true and reliable friends are much scarcer in important situations than at meals and drinking parties (*πόσιος καὶ βρώσιος*) and in ll. 997-

---

[2] West 1974: 42-3.

[3] Bowra 1954: 37-43 takes *ἐν δορί* in its literal sense, "at my spear;" Davison 1960: 1-4 and Gentili 1965a: 129-34, as "ship;" Ehrenberg 1962: 239-40, as a metonymy for "at warfare;" Kirkwood 1974: 31 and Arnould 1980: 284-94, "on watch;" Giangrande 1972: 37-40 as "the pillory."

[4] Cf. Anacr. 373: *ἠρίστησα μὲν ἰτρίου λεπτοῦ μικρὸν ἀποκλάς, / οἴνου δ' ἐξέπιον κάδον.* See also Gerber 1970: 14.

1002 he mentions a meal (*δείπνου δὲ λήγοιμεν, ὅπου τινὰ θυμὸς ἀνώγοι, / παντοίων ἀγαθῶν γαστρὶ χαριζόμενοι*).

2. *Wine Drinking*

Archilochus:
In fr. 2 the speaker claims that his wine (like his bread) is hanging from his spear (*ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος*) and that he even drinks reclining on that spear (*πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος*).[5] In fr. 4 the drinking group is made up of soldiers on military duty. The speaker asks one of his companions to go to the rowers' benches and bring wine (*ἀλλ' ἄγε σὺν κώθωνι...κοίλων πώματ' ἄφελκε κάδων...ἄγρει δ' οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν ἀπὸ τρυγός*).[6]

Callinus:
In the opening line of fr. 1, in which the poet exhorts the young men to fight the enemy, he asks them *μέχρις τέο κατάκεισθε;* The verb *κατάκειμαι* may have the meaning of "recline in the symposium"[7] and indeed several scholars have taken it as referring to a convivial situation.[8]

Solon:
In fr. 26 the poet rejoices at the *ἔργα Κυπρογενοῦς, Διονύσου καὶ Μουσέων. ἔργα Διονύσου* indicates participation in the symposia, and the same is true of fr. 4.9-10, in which Solon mentions *παρούσας εὐφροσύνας.*

Theognis:
Among the activities which Cyrnus is advised to pursue together with his fellow aristocrats is attendance at drinking parties (*πῖνε*, 33). The poet draws up certain guidelines of behavior, pointing out that unlim-

---

[5] For the connotations of *ἐν δορί*, see above on *Food/Eating*.

[6] The majority of commentators accept that the drinking takes place on board ship, see, for instance, Gerber 1981: 1-11 for the ship being beached. But see Bowie 1993: 29, who thinks that the poem is performed in an ordinary symposium where familiar military experiences are recalled, while admitting that it is "easier to suggest that a poem belongs to sympotic elegy than to prove it."

[7] For instance, Ar. *Ach.* 985; Hdt. 3.121; Pl. *Symp.* 185d.

[8] Reitzenstein 1893: 50; Bowra 1938: 14; Tedeschi 1978: 203-9; Bowie 1990: 223 ff. *Contra* Campbell 1967: 162-3; Gerber 1970: 44; Herington 1985: 32. Also Latacz 1977: 229-38, who emphasizes the strong similarities between the exhortations of Callinus and those of the Iliadic heroes, thus rejecting the immediate sympotic connotations.

ited consumption of wine is not desirable (*οἶνόν τοι πίνειν πολὺν κακόν*, 211), while drinking in moderation is a sign of virtue (*ἢν δέ τις αὐτὸν πίνει ἐπισταμένως...ἀγαθός*, 212). In l. 115 Theognis contemplates human nature, claiming that while companions at wine-drinking parties are numerous (*πολλοί τοι πόσιος...εἰσιν ἑταῖροι*), not all of them are trustworthy.[9] There is an abundance of additional sympotic references spread throughout the corpus.[10]

3. *Serious/Gnomic Reflection*

Archilochus:

Several fragments treat themes pertinent to the relationship of the individual with his community or of mortals with the gods. In fr. 14 the speaker reminds Aesimides that taking into account the opinions of others brings no happiness, and in fr. 15 he acknowledges that friendship is frequently understood as expedience.[11] In fr. 16 he tells Pericles that everything is in the power of chance and fate, while in fr. 17 he pronounces that success comes through effort and exertion. To these fragments one might add those consolatory poems that are composed ostensibly for a particular private occasion, namely, the death of the speaker's brother-in-law at sea, but, in fact, are general reflective poems: in fr. 11 the speaker recognizes the irrelevance of mourning and in fr. 13 the universality of suffering.

Mimnermus:

The opposition between old age and youth is perhaps the most prominent theme,[12] treated in no fewer than five fragments. In fr. 1.5-10 the

[9] In Theognis *ἀρετή* is the exclusive property of the aristocratic minority, while *κακία* is the condition of those not sharing the privileges of high birth. Edmunds 1985: 104 suggests that the entire poetry of Theognis is characterized by polarities and that the attribution of blame and praise is a fundamental function of his *σοφίη*. The real *ἀγαθός* is laudable and consequently *φίλος*, while the *κακός* deserves to be an *ἐχθρός*. See also Cobb-Stevens 1985: 159 on the value system of Theognis and the pairing of opposites, like *δίκη / ὕβρις* and *μέτρον / κόρος*.

[10] 413-4; 473-96; 497-8; 499-502; 503-8; 509-10; 533-4; 627-8; 643-4; 837-40; 841-4; 873-6; 879-84; 989-90; 1039-40; 1041-2; 1045-6; 1047-8; 1129-32.

[11] Fr. 15: *Γλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχηται.* For *ἐπίκουρος* meaning "ally," not "mercenary," and its subtle connection with the Homeric use of the term, see Lavelle 1997: 235-6, 239. For the same idea, cf. Arist. *Eth. Eudem.* 123a33: *διὰ τὸ χρήσιμόν ἐστιν ἡ τῶν πλείστων φιλία.*

[12] The intensity with which the theme is treated is rarely found in lyric poetry as a whole (Anacreon is a close counterpart) and nowhere else in archaic elegy. Tyrtaeus had made the contrast between youth and old age, but only in an embryonic form and

poet laments the fact that old age (*ὀδυνηρόν* and *ἀργαλέον γῆρας*) brings many worries and indignities (*ἐχθρὸς μὲν παισίν, ἀτίμαστος δὲ γυναιξίν*); similar sentiments are expressed in frr. 3 and 5. In fr. 2 the poet states that death is to be preferred to old age (*τεθνάναι βέλτιον ἢ βίοτος*), and the same view is repeated in fr. 5 (*γῆρας, ὃ καὶ θανάτου ῥίγιον ἀργαλέου*). The appropriate age and circumstances of death for a man are reflected in fr. 6. In fr. 7 it is stated that the opinions of others should be ignored,[13] and in fr. 8 truth, which should be practiced, is recognized as the highest justice.

Solon:
In addition to issues related to the socio-economic conditions in Athens, Solon frequently contemplates the human lot in general. His elegies contain reflections on the proper age for death, 20; significance of fellowship at the moment of death, 21; equality of all mortals in the face of death, 24; stages of human life, 27; value of education throughout life, 18; universality of human unhappiness, 14; inability to know the will of the gods, 16, 17; ingredients of a fortunate life, 23.

Theognis:
His corpus includes abundance of advice on proper behavior, interaction of the aristocrats among themselves and with members of the lower classes, and also aphorisms on the human condition in general. Using ll. 27-236 as a sample of the corpus, one can point out a number of gnomic reflections on: dependence of good or bad fortune on the gods, 133-4, 171-2; human ignorance and lack of foresight, 135-42; reversibility of human fortunes through the agency of the gods, 155-66; human greed provoking *ἄτη*, 227-32; untrustworthiness of men, 83-6, and pursuit of unfair profit as the distinguishing factor between good and bad men, 221-6.

---

incidentally to his main theme: in 10.19 ff. he points out that it is shameful for a young man to flee the first rank of battle, leaving behind older men with white hair and gray beard to fight and fall in the line of duty. Later he says that it is proper for a young man to die for his country *ὄφρ' ἐρατῆς ἥβης ἀγλαὸν ἄνθος ἔχῃ*, 10.28. In a similar manner, Solon, enumerating the ten ages of man, devotes a few lines to old age, but he simply refers to it as part of the cycle of life (27.15-8).

[13] Cf. Arch. 14 and Thgn. 795-6.

4. *Military References*

Archilochus:
In fr. 1 the speaker claims that he is both a poet and a soldier (*θεράπων Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος*) and in fr. 2, that his bread and wine are hanging from (or depend on) his spear. Fr. 3 mentions a war which is fought not with bows or slings but solely with the sword and spear,[14] and fr. 6 makes a reference to soldiers delivering injuries to their enemies (*ξείνια δυσμενέσι λυγρὰ χαριζόμενοι*). Fr. 4 depicts drinking, but in a setting that is clearly military (nightwatch, *ἐν φυλακῆι*). In fr. 5 he expresses his elation over the fact that he has saved his life, despite the loss of his shield. In fr. 15, although the theme is more general (friendship versus expedience), the imagery is military (*ἐπίκουρος*).[15]

Callinus:
His poetry consists mostly of military exhortations. For Callinus, military virtue is the most important asset for a man: he must fight valiantly (cf. *ἄλκιμος θυμός*, 1.1; *ἄλκιμον ἦτορ*, 1.10; *κρατερόφρων ἀνήρ*, 1.18) to secure the honor and esteem of his community (*τιμῆέν καὶ ἀγλαὸν μάχεσθαι γῆς πέρι*, 1.6; *λαῶι σύμπαντι πόθος*, 1.18; *ἄξιος ἡμιθέων*, 1.19; *ὥσπερ γάρ μιν πύργον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὁρῶσι*, 1.20). Lack of bravery is shameful, leading to derision (*οὐδ' αἰδεῖσθ' ἀμφιπερικτίονας*, 1.2). Fr. 4 mentions a military leader of the Trerians, a warlike Thracian tribe that fought against the Magnesians, and fr. 5a is a reference to the attack of the Cimmerians against Sardis.[16]

---

[14] The references to Euboea (5) and a plain (3) have been taken as indications that this may be a treatment of the Lelantine War between Chalcis and Eretria, on the basis of a passage by Strabo (10.1.12) that informs us that the two enemies agreed to abstain from the use of long-range weapons. But as Gerber 1970: 13 notes, the tenses of the fragment are in the future while the Lelantine War took place ca. 700 B.C.E., that is, earlier than the traditional dates for Archilochus.

[15] Soldiery in Archilochus is neither enjoyable nor glorious: fr. 2 (*πίνω δ' ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος*) suggests a perennial state of readiness. Weariness and toil are also conveyed in fr. 4 (*οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς / νηφέμεν ἐν φυλακῆι τῆιδε δυνησόμεθα*); cf. also *ἔργον πολύνοστον* (i.e., the work of the swords, fr. 3). In all of Archilochus' elegiac fragments there is only one term indicating fame, but even this has nothing to do with valor *per se*, since it refers to technical ability (the expertise of the Abantes in using the spear, *δουρικλυτοί*, fr. 3).

[16] Frr. 2 and 2a are a prayer of the Ephesians to Zeus for help and may come from a treatment of the war with the Magnesians, cf. Strabo 14.1.40 and Ath. 525c.

Tyrtaeus:
The bulk of his poetry is represented by frr. 10, 11 and 12, all of which are military exhortations. The poet urges the young Spartans to fight with the greatest resolution because only in this way do they become *ἀγαθοί.* Fr. 5 has as its theme the twenty-year war that the Spartans fought against the Messenians. A war between the same opponents (cf. *ἡμεῖς*, 11, versus *Μεσσηνίων*, 6) appears also in fr. 23: the context is mutilated, but the military terms appearing throughout the fragment leave no doubt that the topic is a battle (*τεῖχος*, 3, 7; *ἀντίοι ἱστάμενοι*, 9; *οἱ δ' ἐκτὸς* [*βελέων*, 10; *πύργου*, 12). Frr. 13, 14, and 17 seem to exalt bravery (*λέοντος ἔχων ἐν στήθεσι θυμόν*, 13; *ἀρετῆς*, 14; *ἥρωες*, 17). The fragments from the *P. Berol.* 11675 (18-23) are military, and elsewhere the testimonia (frr. 8 and 9) give additional information about the treatment of similar themes.

Mimnermus:
The longest fragment with a military theme is fr. 14, which praises the virtue of a Smyrnean warrior against the Lydians in language reminiscent of Callinus and Tyrtaeus, and which may come from the poems mentioned by Pausanias.[17] In fr. 13a, which comes from the *Smyrneis*, some soldiers, upon receiving a message or response from the king, arouse themselves to a state of military alert, and in fr. 17 a Paeonian officer is leading his men.[18]

Theognis:
In ll. 549-54 the speaker indicates that war may be at hand (cf. *πόλεμον πολύδακρυν ἐγείρει*, 549 and *ἀλλ' ἵπποις ἔμβαλλε ταχυπτέρνοισι χαλινούς*, 551) but the subject receives no further treatment. The poet's negative disposition toward war is suggested in l. 886 (*κακοῦ δ' οὐκ ἔραμαι πολέμου*).

---

[17] Paus. 9.29.4: *Μίμνερμος δὲ ἐλεγεῖα ἐς μάχην ποιήσας τὴν Σμυρναίων πρὸς Γύγην τε καὶ Λυδούς.*

[18] Allen 1993: 127: "This fragment may have come from a poem which referred to recent military events in Asia Minor. But there was also a tradition that the Paeones were originally colonists from among the Teucrians of Troy, so that Mimnermus may have been interested in them simply as legendary folk."

5. *City Affairs/History/Politics*

Mimnermus:

In fr. 9 he states that people from Pylos, having arrived and settled in Colophon, set out from there and captured Aeolian Smyrna. The poet's reference is the earliest extant testimony to migration to Ionia and the fragment may be an example of how early poetry was used in the preservation of the historical records of a city.[19]

Tyrtaeus:

Frr. 1-4 come from the *Eunomia*, a poem which makes frequent references to the history of the Spartan state and its organization. Tyrtaeus' claim that the city and its institutions were given to the Lacedaemonians by Zeus and Apollo may have been an attempt to avert social change.[20] In frr. 6 and 7 the poet mentions the miserable conditions to which the inhabitants of the Messenian plains were reduced after their revolt.

Solon:

He is a statesman who uses his poetry to advance and defend his political agenda. In frr. 1, 2 and 3 he attempts to convince the Athenians not to abandon Salamis to the Megarians through use of the themes of humiliation and shame (cf. *Σαλαμιναφετέων*, fr. 2 and *χαλεπὸν αἶσχος*, fr. 3). In fr. 4 the poet warns the citizens against *Δυσνομίη* and enumerates the evils associated with injustice, unchecked greed and disregard for the laws, leading to internal strife and decline of the city (cf. fr. 4a). Similar views are expressed in frr. 4c, 6 and 13. Preservation of the socio-political institutions and prevention of a tyranny are discussed in frr. 9, 10 and 11. Frr. 5 and 15 are political as well.

Theognis:

His interests lie, to a great extent, in issues of relationships among social classes. The poet's oligarchic advice throughout the corpus defines the role of the aristocracy in the governing of the city; see, for instance, ll. 39-52, in which the high-born are perceived as the pillars

---

[19] Allen 1993: 75 and Dougherty 1994: 37. For performance setting, see Bowie 1986: 13-35 (narrative elegy treating foundation material as performed at public festivals).

[20] Aristotle (*Pol.* 1306b36) tells us that during the time of Tyrtaeus there was social unrest due to lack of land, and that many dissatisfied citizens wanted redistribution of it and also a change of the constitution.

of civic order, while the low-born are destroyers of the city. In Theognis' corpus there is abundant advice for modes of proper behavior, all of which have a strong political color:[21] act with honor and avoid unjust deeds, 87-100, 143-50, 197-208; associate with aristocrats and avoid the company of the low-born, 31-36, 69-72, 101-14; do not marry a low-born woman, 183-96; walk the middle road, 219-20.

6. *Erotic/Sexual References*

Archilochus:

Fr. 331 (*συκῆ πετραίη πολλὰς βόσκουσα κορώνας / εὐήθης ξείνων δέκτρια Πασιφίλη*) is attributed to Archilochus by Athenaeus but has been treated with skepticism by many scholars (Pfeiffer, Lasserre and Bonard, Gerber, Treu), primarily because it has the air of an epigram. Page also rejects the couplet on linguistic grounds,[22] and West places it under under *Errores*).[23] Fr. 331 is indeed very different from anything else, not only in Archilochus but in archaic elegy as a whole. The couplet is too sexually allusive, sarcastic and abusive for this genre: the poet is addressing a prostitute, or one depicted as such (note the reference to the fig-tree with its strong sexual connotations).[24] Erotic subjects are absent from the limited corpus of Archilochus' uncontested elegies.

Tyrtaeus:

He makes one or two very oblique erotic references: in 10.5-6 *κουριδίηι τ' ἀλόχωι* is just one of a string of beloved ones who will be lost in case of defeat; in 10.29 one who fights bravely and survives is

---

[21] Using again ll. 27-236 as a sample of the collection.

[22] Page 1963: 136-7: "*δέκτρια* is a bold invention not to be found again before the Christian era. If we look for a more evident hall-mark of forgery, I suggest we find it in the word *εὐήθης*…there is no evidence that this adjective existed in the world until two hundred years after the lifetime of Archilochus." Rankin's 1977a: 117n.42 objection that lack of occurrences of the terms in the early literature should not be taken as an indication of their non-existence has merit, but the cumulative weight of evidence argues against Archilochian authorship.

[23] West 1974: 140 suggests that, since Athenaeus uses the fragment to refer to the famous Milesian courtesan Plangon (fourth century), probably he has mistakenly attributed it to Archilochus, instead of another poet *Ἀρχίας* or *Ἀρχίλαος*; see also West 1970: 148. Bergk emends the name *Ἀρχίλοχος* to *Ἀντίλοχος*.

[24] The lines may also refer to *Od.* 12.231 (*Σκύλλην πετραίην ἥ μοι φέρε πῆμ' ἑτάροισιν*), thus indicating invective against Pasiphile through allusion to a female who "brought grief" to Odysseus and his crew; cf. Rankin 1977a: 41, Burnett 1983: 79, Clay 2001: 110, who defend Athenaeus' attribution to Archilochus.

ἐρατὸς γυναιξί, in other words, his valor evokes not only honor from the community but also erotic desire from its female members.

Mimnermus:
His poetry contains two very restrained references to love: *κρυπταδίη φιλότης καὶ μείλιχα δῶρα καὶ εὐνή*, 1.3, and *ἐχθρὸς μὲν παισίν, ἀτίμαστος γυναιξίν*, 1.9. The poet introduces the subject not in an address to a lover but rather incidentally, in a poem with a strong gnomic flavor (the advantages of youth over old age, 1.1-5). Frr. 5, 8, 9, 12, which come from the collection *Nanno,* supposedly named after a flute-player and hetaera (Athenaeus) whom Mimnermus loved (Hermesianax), are not erotic.[25] Fr. 21a contains a proverb with strong sexual color (*ἄριστα χωλὸς οἰφεῖ*), mentioned somewhere by Mimnermus (*οἴφειν*: to mount—of human beings). The proverb is even more sexually charged than the spurious Arch. 331, but the genre in which it appears is unclear; the meter, as the proverb stands, is not elegiac.[26]

Solon:
Only two erotic elegiac couplets survive, but certainly there were more, cf. *P. Hercul.* 1384 fr. 1: *καὶ ἐλεγείας γε περὶ τοῦ ἐρᾶν συνέγραψεν* (fr. 26). The couplets probably derive from different poems, since the one is expressed in the third person (25) and the other in the first (26). Fr. 25 may be part of a definition of *ἐρωτικὸς ἀνήρ*, to use the term of Plutarch, who quotes the passage, while fr. 26, according to the testimonia, is associated with the theme of old age.

Theognis:
The second book (1231-1389) is a collection of amatory poems, most frequently addressed to an unnamed *παῖς* but also to particular

---

[25] There is another fragment (24) which Bergk and Meineke accept as also coming from *Nanno* and of which only the headline is preserved (*κατὰ ἰατρῶν*). The attribution, however, is not clear (West places it under *Dubia et Spuria*). For the (probably Hellenistic) romantic picture of Mimnermus being inspired by the love for a girl, see West 1974: 75: "Perhaps even one or two references would have been considered a sufficient basis for a romantic construction which made her his great love."

[26] Gentili 1965b: 386 and 1988: 244-5n.28, by emending the text through the addition of a *δὲ* before *χωλός*, attempts to impose a dactylic meter and show that elegy, too, contains obscenity. No ancient authority states that Mimnermus wrote iambic poetry but the poet's name is attached to an epigram (*A.P.* 7.405) for the gravestone of Hipponax (who is later); fr. 26 which is probably by Menander instead; and two other iambic fragments (24, 25), which, despite Stobaeus' attribution, cannot be Mimnermus' because they are in Attic rather than Ionian dialect, see Allen 1993: 26-9.

individuals (Simonides, Cyrnus). The erotic expression is restrained (cf. *ὦ παῖ, μαργοσύνηις ἀπό μευ νόον ὤλεσας ἐσθλόν*, 1271; *ἐκλέλυμαι δὲ πόθου*, 1339), and, as in the rest of the collection, the didactic element is quite prominent. See also 1063-6 and the potentially erotic 949-54.

7. *Mythological References*

Mimnermus:

In frr. 11 and 11a, which come from the same poem, Mimnermus tells of the adventures of Jason and of his visit to the house of Aeetes in the East, on the banks of the Ocean, where the Sun stores his beams in a golden room. In fr. 12 the poet describes the Sun's daily routine: during the night he is carried from the land of the Hesperids on a golden bed to the land of the Aethiopians, where in the morning his swift chariot and horses are waiting for him. Fr. 4 mentions the well-known story of Tithonus, who, having obtained immortality, had to spend his unending life as an old man. The brevity of the fragment makes it impossible to tell whether it comes from a mythological narrative or it is simply a reference in passing in a treatment of the theme of old age. In fr. 18 the poet mentions the Trojan hero Daetes, and elsewhere, we learn from the testimonia, Mimnermus deals with other mythological subjects as well (whether briefly or more extensively we do not know).[27]

Theognis:

In 699-718 there are references to Sisyphus, spanning more than ten lines, and to Rhadamanthus, Nestor, Harpies, and the Children of Boreas. All, however, are used as examples of gifts (cunning, wisdom, eloquence, swiftness of foot) which would have remained unsought by mortals had wealth been an option. In 1123-8 the hardships of Odysseus are also used as an example of suffering; in 1209-10, the speaker is Aethon (Odysseus' adopted name in his conversation with Penelope, *Od.* 19.183). In 1231-4 Eros is blamed for bringing ruin to Troy,

---

[27] Cf. Ael. *V.H.* 12.36: *ἐοίκασιν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν τῆς Νιόβης παίδων μὴ συνᾴδειν ἀλλήλοις...Μίμνερμος εἴκοσι*, fr. 19; *Argum.* ii (Sallustii) in Soph. *Ant.*: *Μίμνερμος δέ φησι τὴν μὲν Ἰσμήνην προσομιλοῦσαν Θεοκλυμένῳ ὑπὸ Τυδέως κατὰ Ἀθηνᾶς ἐγκέλευσιν τελευτῆσαι*, fr. 21; Paus. 9.29.4: *Μίμνερμος δέ...φησὶν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ θυγατέρας Οὐρανοῦ τὰς ἀρχαιοτέρας Μούσας, τούτων δὲ ἄλλας νεωτέρας εἶναι Διὸς παῖδας*, fr. 13.

Theseus and Ajax; in 1287-94 there is a reference to Atalanta; and in 1345-50 the speaker justifies his love to his addressee by using as an example the abduction of Ganymede by Zeus.

8. *Prayer*

Callinus:
In frr. 2 and 2a the Smyrneans address Zeus (*Σμυρναίους δ' ἐλέησον*), reminding him of their previous sacrifices in his honor (*μνῆσαι δ', εἴ κοτέ τοι μηρία καλὰ βοῶν ⟨Σμυρναῖοι κατέκηαν⟩*).

Solon:
The opening of fr. 13 is an invocation to the Muses but the request is not for poetic inspiration. The goddesses are asked to provide the speaker with prosperity, good reputation and the ability to be helpful ("sweet," *γλυκύν*, 5) to his friends, while a menace to his enemies (*πικρόν*, 5).

Theognis:
There are numerous prayers in the collection. The gods invoked are: Apollo, 1-4, 5-10, 773-82; Artemis, 11-4; Muses and Graces, 15-8; Zeus, 341-50, 373-92, 731-52; Castor and Polydeuces, 1087-90; Plutus; 1117-8; Aphrodite, 1323-6. The requests range from good fortune (Apollo, 1-4) and protection from evil (Artemis, 11-4) to strength for revenge (Zeus, 341-50) and dispelling of "soul-eating worries" (Aphrodite, 1323-6). Two of the invocations to Zeus contain no obvious request but rather an expression of aporia: the speaker wonders how it is possible for the righteous god to allow wicked mortals to prosper, 373-92, 731-52. In 1087-90 Castor and Polydeuces are begged to grant ills to those who offer ill advice to a friend.

9. *Distant Places*

Solon:
Herodotus (5. 113.2), Plutarch (*Sol.* 26.2-4) and *Vita Arati* (p. 7.14 Martin), quite likely drawing their information from his poetry, inform us that Solon visited Cyprus. The way in which they refer to this visit suggests in fact that the poet must have included some detail of the geography and also the people of the island (cf. Solon's address to Philocyprus, one of the local kings, in fr. 19). The poet also mentions a visit to Egypt, perhaps describing it at some length if we may ex-

trapolate from his attention to topographical detail in the only surviving line of his report (*Νείλου ἐπὶ προχοῇισι, Κανωβίδος ἐγγύθεν ἀκτῆς*, 28).

B. *Trimeters and Elegy: A Comparison*

1. *Food/Eating*

In the trimeters food and eating are one of the elements appearing in all four poets, although unevenly distributed diachronically: while in Archilochus and Semonides they occur sparingly, in Solon and Hipponax they increase exponentially. Culinary topics, then, although part of the iambic thematography from the beginning, may have gained importance only after the first generation. In elegy the limited references to food and eating (appearing mostly in a drinking context) indicate that the subject, although admissible, is transient and treated only incidentally. In this respect elegy is close to the early trimeters and noticeably different from the later trimeters of Solon and Hipponax, in which there is an emphasis on the theme of food.

2. *Wine Drinking*

This, too, is one of the elements appearing in all four iambic poets, but its frequency of occurrence is rather low: in Archilochus wine drinking is probably mentioned twice, and in Semonides there are no direct references, although there is mention of drinking paraphernalia (*ἀρυστήρ, κύλιξ, ποτήρια*) in three fragments. In Solon, the first word in fr. 38 is *πίνουσι* and Hipponax, in two fragments, depicts Arete drinking with her companion, while in fr. 67 he makes a derogatory remark about those who drink too much. References to wine, then, although spread throughout the three generations, never seem to have become an important theme in the trimeters. In elegy wine drinking occurs in Archilochus and Theognis and is alluded to in Callinus and Solon. In most of the poets it appears as a marginal theme, but Theognis makes it abundantly clear that drinking is one of the accepted topics of elegiac poetry, on occasion the symposium functioning even as a metaphor for the city and its institutions. In short, while in the trimeters the theme of wine drinking retains a low profile throughout the period under consideration, in elegy there may have been an evolution

from a rudimentary treatment in the early stages, to a more persistent and elaborate one towards the later part of the sixth century.[28]

3. *Serious/Political Reflection*

The speaker in Archilochus' trimeters makes value judgments on wealth and power, reflects on the individuality of personal taste, contemplates the burden of misfortunes fallen upon communities and underlines the strength of human bonds. In Semonides, serious subject matter is very prominent as the poet contemplates the fragility of mortals as opposed to the power of the gods; death; old age; betrayal of human expectations; and the character of woman. Solon's trimeters are mostly political and in addition contain what we may call "oblique reflection:" while the poet recounts his own efforts and successes in alleviating the suffering of the Athenian people through social reforms, he seems to have in mind general principles of more overarching importance. In elegy serious reflection is the most noticeable thematic characteristic: the relationship between the individual and the community, mortals and gods (fate, divine power versus human fragility), nature of friendship, justice, success, happiness, youth, old age and death are explored extensively and consistently. To this we might add the prominence and overlapping of reflection on social and political realities. Serious contemplation is one of the fundamental thematic conventions and one of the elements that bring this genre into proximity with the pre-Hipponactean trimeters.

4. *Military References*

The occasional references to war and weaponry in the iambic poets appear almost always either in figurative speech or in passing. In Archilochus, however, fr. 18 may come from a poem that discusses a military theme more substantially, since elsewhere Ares is always treated soberly and Eustathius refers to the fragment in the context of a discussion of an Iliadic passage. In fr. 20, the poet mentions the misfortunes of the Thasians, and their comparison to the Magnesians, subdued by the Ephesians, may indicate the unhappy outcome either of a war with another city or civil strife on the island. Although both

[28] Xenophanes, a little later, provides us, through minute detailing, with an eloquent example (fr. B1) of the refinement of treatment the symposium receives in poetry by the turn of the sixth century.

fragments are too short to be conclusive, they nevertheless credibly suggest that Archilochus may treat military topics in his trimeters. Elegy, on the other hand, is prominently military: in Archilochus, the speaker of fr. 1 identifies himself as *θεράπων Ἐνυαλίοιο*, and throughout his elegiac corpus the poet makes heavy use of military imagery and themes. The limited corpora of Callinus and Tyrtaeus as well as the surviving testimonia make clear that their interests lie in issues of public importance, such as wars or city history. Mimnermus, too, contains a number of fragments (13a, 14, 17) that indicate that military themes were also part of his repertory. In Solon, military motifs seem to be peripheral and in Theognis virtually non-existent.[29] The military connection, then, between elegy and the trimeters, although not securely established, is possible, at least in the generation of Archilochus.

5. *Erotic/Sexual References*

Graphic portrayal of sexual scenes and direct references to male and female genitalia are a characteristic of the poetries of all iambic poets, except Solon. Sexually explicit language, besides its voyeuristic nature, functions also as a means of invective, frequently targeting a foe's manliness. Elegy is much more restrained in the expression of erotic desire, cf., for instance, Mimnermus' *κρυπταδίη φιλότης καὶ μείλιχα δῶρα καὶ εὐνή*, 1.3, or Theognis' *ὦ παῖ, μαργοσύνης ἀπό μεν νόον ὤλεσας ἐσθλόν*, 1271. The unabashed sexual depictions of the trimeters find their elegiac counterparts in muted erotic allusions.

6. *Mythological References*

The presence of mythological themes in the trimeters is uncertain: Archilochus did make use of them but whether in this particular genre or

[29] Despite the presence of military themes, Mimnermus does not seem to be deeply interested in military subjects (the major part of his poetry is devoted to other topics). Perhaps Archilochus, Callinus, and Tyrtaeus are the first and last generation of archaic elegists for whom military themes become a central motif. One wonders whether we should read more into Mimnermus' mention that the heroic behavior of the warrior (fr. 14) is part of the past. No elegist for a number of generations uses military language in a significant way: in Solon, despite the paramount presence of political language, military motifs are minor; in Theognis and Xenophanes, absent. Simonides did write about the military confrontations between the Greeks and the Persians *δι' ἐλεγείας* (Suda; cf. the new Simonides), but his date is later, outside the archaic period.

elsewhere we do not know (Nessus speaking in fr. 34?). Hipponax's reference to the death of king Rhesus by the walls of Troy (72), is again too short to inspire confidence, but the compactness of the lines suggests that the treatment must have been short, perhaps made in the context of abusive remarks, as is the situation in other cases in which mythological names appear. The corpora of Mimnermus and Theognis indicate that mythological subjects do appear in elegy, although the references in the latter poet are short, functioning as examples or devices illustrating human folly rather than narratives in their own right. Mimnermus's use of myth is more obscure, but his work may have contained passages of considerable length. Affinity therefore between elegy and the trimeters on the basis of mythological treatment remains problematic, although possible.

7. *Prayer*

In the trimeters prayers occur in Archilochus and Hipponax. In elegy they appear in Callinus, Solon, and Theognis. It is noteworthy that some of Theognis' prayers have as their subject the punishment of the wicked, which brings to mind Archilochus' prayer to Apollo (26). Ironically, the prayers of the very abusive Hipponax concentrate on the personal needs of the speaker rather than on the destruction of enemies.

8. *Exotic/Distant Setting*

In the trimeters Archilochus must have mentioned Siris, at least in some detail, contrasting its geography and people to those of Thasos. Hipponax refers to a number of Lydia's landmarks. In his elegies Solon treats of visits to Cyprus and also to Egypt. The address to king Philocyprus and the topographical detail about the Nile and Canopus suggest that these passages are more than references in passing, although how extensive they are is impossible to tell. Interest, then, in the treatment of topography and distant lands appears in both elegy and the trimeters, although the subject seems to have remained of lesser importance in both genres.

The discussion above suggests that there is considerable common ground between elegy and the trimeters in terms of thematography. The fact that the same poets wrote both elegiac and iambic poems may

be a further indication of their thematic links:[30] food, wine drinking, socio-political order, prayer, references to distant lands, gnomic reflection, and potentially military and mythological themes occur in both elegy and the trimeters. Among these common elements, the most significant is serious reflection.[31] Solon, whose trimeters (and tetrameters) cannot be distinguished from his elegiacs in terms of subject matter, is the best example of the affinities between the two kinds of poetry. The similarities between the iambics and the elegies of Archilochus have been pointed out by Dover and Page;[32] for Dover, there are not even grounds to think that Archilochus regarded his elegiac and iambic poems as different genres.[33] Yet it seems that the overlapping between the two genres is not complete, since, despite the similarities in a wide range of themes, the trimeters contain elements that are only insinuated in elegy. This is evident not only in the use of sexually explicit language, but also in the nature of censure. Paraenetic discourse, although important in both genres, is much more aggressive and unrestricted in the trimeters, for instance in the use of animal fables (absent in elegy), which utilize imagery from the everyday domestic world to convey a statement, usually not only didactic but also censorious.[34] But despite such differences, elegy and

[30] Besides Archilochus and Solon, who survive in both genres, we are told by Suda that Semonides ἔγραψεν ἐλεγείαν ἐν βιβλίοις β΄, ἰάμβους (σ 446 Adler). In addition to the two books of elegies, he is also mentioned as the poet of an *Archaeology of the Samians* (Ἀρχαιολογία Σαμίων), which may have been in elegiacs, although the genre is uncertain. Hubbard 1996: 255-62 believes that a case can be made that the author of Simonides' elegiac frr. 19-20 is in fact Semonides; he also thinks that the close parallels between Sem. 1 and Mimn. 2 suggest that the "new Simonides" *P. Oxy.* 3965, fr. 26 should not be assigned with confidence to Simonides, because it may be Semonides. On the latter poet's elegiacs, see also Campbell 1967:183-4; Brown 1997: 70-1.

[31] Cf., for instance, West 1974: 32 (referring to Sem. 1): the poem "is a sermon on the vanity of human aspirations and the uselessness of worrying, addressed ὦ παῖ, and no different from what one might find in an elegiac poem—indeed it has much in common with Sol. 13."

[32] Dover 1963: 183-212 and Page 1963: 119-63.

[33] Dover 1963: 189: (There are) "no grounds for believing that he regarded them (i.e., elegiacs and ἴαμβοι) as different genres… he used the word ἴαμβοι with reference to all forms of poem which he composed, their common characteristic being not their meter or language, but the type of occasion for which they were composed –their 'social context.'" But he does not elaborate on the particulars of this "social context."

[34] Cf. Zanetto 2001: 68; Bowie 1993: 31. *Contra* Adrados 1999: 244, who thinks that animal fables are an element of sympotic poetry even outside iambus, as in *scolia* (the crab and the snake, scolium 9 *PMG*), and in elegy. Adrados sees in Theognis

the early trimeters find themselves in thematic contact with each other in various ways, the most important being the presence of serious reflection.[35]

II. Identity of Character

A. *Elegy*

1. *The Speaker (First Person)*

Archilochus:
The first person singular appears in five fragments, the "I" indicating: a soldier claiming talent in poetry, 1; a soldier drinking his wine while leaning on his spear, 2; a soldier asking another soldier to bring wine, 4; a soldier who saves his life by throwing away his shield, 5; an individual reflecting on the uselessness of mourning, 11. The first person plural appears in three fragments. The "we" signifies: the military company engaged in drinking, 4; the clan or wider circle of friends, perhaps the whole community, 12, 13.

Callinus:
No occurrences.

Tyrtaeus:
The "I" appears only once, in fr. 12.1, where the speaker states that the highest virtue for a man is bravery. The first person plural appears in five fragments: in four of them, it signifies the Lacedaemonians, 2, 5, 10, 19 and in the fifth, a group of soldiers, 20.

Mimnermus:
The first person singular appears in four fragments. The "I:" reflects on the brevity of youth and the hardships of old age, 1, 5; urges the practice of truth, 8; mentions a brave warrior who fought against the Lydians, 14. The "we" appears in two fragments signifying: humans

---

similes that are reminiscent of fables concerning the old lion (293 ff.), the man who shelters a snake in his breast (601 ff.), and the dog that crossed a torrent (347 ff.). There is also an allusion to the character of the fox in Solon. But all these references are very oblique.

[35] Dover 1963: 189 refers also to a "community of ethos." Contrast Davies' 1988: 64 reluctance to accept this notion.

in general enjoying the gifts of youth, 2; the poet and his compatriots the Smyrneans fleeing the enemy, 9.

Solon:
The first person singular appears in twelve fragments indicating: an Athenian (patriot-singer, 1; patriot, 2, 4a, 10; patriot-educator, 4; law-giver, 5); unidentified individual reflecting on justice, 13, death 20, 21, old age, 18; Solon addressing king Philocyprus, 19, and his own nephew Critias, 22a. "We" appears in five fragments signifying: the Athenians in general, 3, 4; the Athenian middle class, 4c; the human race, 13; impoverished aristocrats, 15.

Theognis:
The first person singular appears frequently; the citations below are merely examples, not complete lists. The "I:" assures Cyrnus that he is a trustworthy teacher, 27-8, 37-8, 99-100; pronounces aphorisms, 87-9, 97-98, 155, 220; is an exponent of oligarchic sentiment, speaking in derogatory terms of both the low-born and the disloyal aristocrats, 37-8, 367-70; depicts himself as a poet, 237-52, and a performer, 943-4; is a female, 579-82, 861-4;[36] lover of both boys (especially in Book B) and females, 261-6; symposiast, 413-5, 467-98, 503-10; a steed, 257-60.[37] The "we" occurs several times and indicates either the aristocratic class, 183, 224, 235,[38] or humans as a whole, 141, 228. In 1047 "we" signifies the symposiasts.

The first generation of elegiac poetry is characterized by its heavily military atmosphere: of the six occurrences of "I," five appear in Archilochus, of which four signify a soldier in various aspects of his military life; the sixth occurrence, in Tyrtaeus, also appears in a similar context. Yet Archilochus is different in that he depicts events through the intimacy of the speaker's own experiences. The "I" is not strictly self-referential,[39] but it is still the voice of the individual soldier, not of a speaker who becomes the expression of communal mili-

---

[36] The female of 579-82 has been variously understood as a poetess or perhaps a goddess concerned with morality, for instance, *Τύχη, Αἰδώς, Νέμεσις*; that of 861-4, as a female beggar; see West 1974: 156, 160.

[37] The lines may be erotic (the speaker is a female) or even political, in which case a city is perhaps complaining about a bad ruler.

[38] Cf. also 315-8.

[39] Perhaps everybody in Archilochus' audience carries his food and wine hanging from his spear, and also drinks while on military duty; cf. Bowie 1986: 14.

tary pride, as is Tyrtaeus.[40] Archilochus, too, however, switches to a more abstract speaker, as his consolatory poems indicate, and the same is true of Solon, whose first person alternates between autobiographical and generalizing (for the latter, see frr. 18, 20, and 21). In Mimnermus' poetry, the self-references fail to illuminate the obscurity surrounding the speaker, since the "I"s are inclusive enough to be able to represent anyone who sings the songs.[41] Exhortations like *ἀληθείη δὲ παρέστω /σοὶ καὶ ἐμοί, πάντων χρῆμα δικαιότατον* (fr. 8) have the air of an aphorism, the pronouns "I" and "you" standing for everybody, either in a general sense or signifying everybody possessing a certain (aristocratic) status. In Theognis, too, after his self-identification in the beginning of the collection (*Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη / τοῦ Μεγαρέως*, 22-3), the speaker becomes an obscure, gnomic character. He is an aristocrat certainly, but beyond that we cannot say much. One important characteristic, then, of the "I" in archaic elegy is that it very frequently becomes the expressor of more widely shared experiences or values and views, and as such it is devoid of a truly autobiographical nature.

Another characteristic of the archaic elegiac "I" is its diversity: in Archilochus it is that of a soldier, a poet, a member of the clan participating in its experiences, and also a member of the human race in general. In Mimnermus, the first person can be a gnomic speaker and also a chronicler of the city's history; in Solon, a law-giver, patriot, educator, singer, gnomic speaker, visitor to Cyprus, and a family man offering advice to his nephew; in Theognis, a gnomic speaker, political advocate, poet, performer, female, lover, symposiast, and even a steed.

The first person plural follows a pattern on lines similar to those of the "I" but its range is narrower, signifying the human race or whole social classes, the community at large, the clan or a military band to which the speaker may belong.

---

[40] *οὔτ' ἂν μνησαίμην οὔτ' ἐν λόγωι ἄνδρα τιθείην* becomes almost the impersonal "there should be neither *μνήμη* nor *λόγος* for a man who is not brave." The choice of the first verb hints to Tyrtaeus' function as the mouthpiece and memory of the community: *μνησαίμην* < *μνήμη* < *Μνημοσύνη* < *Μοῦσαι*: poetry as preserver of worthy deeds.

[41] The expression *ὅτε μοι μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι* (i.e., the gifts of Aphrodite, 1.2) suggests a speaker young enough to be interested in love, but this may be a reflection of the thematic *topos* of youth versus old age.

In short, the first person in archaic elegy is distinguished by its abstract qualities and its tendency to reflect a wide range of characters and situations.

2. *The Addressee (Second Person)*

Archilochus:
The second person singular appears in five fragments. The addressee is: a soldier asked to bring wine from the nearby ship, 4; Pericles, twice (consoled on account of a fatal shipwreck, 13; advised on the omnipotence of Fortune and Fate, 16); Aesimides, advised to ignore the criticisms of the people, 14; Glaucus, warned of false friendships, 15. The second person plural appears only once, indicating the (mourning) clan, friends, community, 13.

Callinus:
There are two occurrences of the second person singular. "You" indicates Zeus invoked by the Smyrneans, 2, 2a. The second person plural appears once, signifying young men urged to go to war, 1.

Tyrtaeus:
There are two occurrences of the "you" plural, in both cases indicating young men urged to be brave in battle, 10, 11.

Mimnermus:
The second person appears twice, only in the singular, signifying both times an unidentified individual advised to ignore the opinion of others, 7 and to practice truth, 8.

Solon:
The "you" singular appears in three fragments. The addressee is: king Philocyprus, who is asked to facilitate Solon's return to his homeland, 19; Ligiastades, recipient of advice, 20; an unidentified individual, urged to be obedient to the authorities, 30. The "you" plural appears in three fragments. The addressees are: the rich Athenians, exhorted to show moderation, 4c; the Athenians, chastised for lack of political foresight, 11; the Muses, to whom the poet prays, 13.

Theognis:
The most frequent addressee is Cyrnus (*Κύρνος* or *Πολυπαΐδης*), who receives gnomic and political advice; but, in addition, there are addresses to other named individuals (Simonides, 469, 667; Democles

923; Timagoras, 1059, Demonax, 1085) or an unidentified lover, *παῖς*. The addressee may also be a friend who is welcomed as a guest (511-22); an enemy (595-602); a sailor (691-2); a poet/singer (Academus, 993); a female slave (1211-6). On several occasions (695, 877, 1029)[42] the addressee is the speaker's own soul (*θυμός*). The second person plural is absent.[43]

In the consolatory poems of Archilochus "you" and "we" appear to be interchangeable, both in essence signifying the entire community: fr. 13 starts with Pericles as the addressee but some lines later the expression changes into "we" terms, and finally the speaker urges the clan, friends, and community in the second person plural to show self-restraint.[44] Four of the five addresses in Archilochus contain the name of the addressee, and all four have a gnomic character. The addressee's identity seems to be unconnected to the speaker's argument, although it is possible that his name may trigger—on occasion not without some humor—the treatment of a particular theme.[45] Mimnermus and Solon's extant addresses are gnomic and probably directed to a friend, relative or an *eromenos* (except Sol. 19), in the manner of Archilochus and Theognis. The latter's poetry is frequently intended ostensibly for a named individual, although often the advice is not expressed in second person singular terms, but in third person. More-

---

[42] Also in 213, if the line is genuine.

[43] It is possible that the first words of line 1160a, which is textually uncertain, may be *ὦ νέοι*.

[44] Consolatory discourse seems to use simultaneously first and second persons as a way of identification with the mourner and as an expression of sympathy on the speaker's part: in Pericles' Funeral Oration (Thuc. 2.35.1ff.), for instance, while the thought is mainly expressed in the first person plural (*χρώμεθα πολιτείᾳ, διαφέρομεν τῶν ἐναντίων, φιλοκαλοῦμεν μετ᾽ εὐτελείας*, etc.), towards the end it is articulated exclusively in the second person (*μὴ περιορᾶσθε τοὺς κινδύνους, ὅσοι πάρεστε, ἴτε*, etc.). Cf. also Tyrtaeus' exhortation *θυμῶι γῆς περὶ τῆσδε μαχώμεθα*, followed immediately by *ὦ νέοι, ἀλλὰ μάχεσθε* (10.13 ff.). Cal. 1 turns the initial direct address (*κατάκεισθε, ἕξετε θυμόν, οὐδ᾽ αἰδεῖσθ᾽, δοκεῖτε*) to a more impersonal mode (*τις ἀκοντισάτω, τιμῆεν ἐστί, τις ἴτω*, and so on). In Tyrt. 11 the structure is annular: lines 1-10 are expressed in the second person plural, 11-34 in the impersonal third, and lines 35-8 back to "you" plural.

[45] It may be, of course, the other way around, that is, that the name itself of the addressee is the by-product of the poem's content (cf. "the son of Mr. Right," Aesimides, who is advised to ignore the reproaches of the crowd, fr. 14). This would presuppose, however, a pretended addressee, which is more difficult to substantiate in the light of the undisputed historicity of another addressee (in both elegies and iambus), Glaucus.

over, the type of behavior suggested by the speaker reflects traditional aristocratic ideals, and as such is of much wider relevance, at least among upper-class circles.[46] As with the "I," then, the second person singular is very often used abstractly, whether the recipient of gnomic advice is named or not.

In addition, in a manner similar again to that of the elegiac "I," the "you" singular is diverse: in Archilochus it may signify a soldier asked to bring wine, a relative or a friend who needs consolation, a recipient of gnomic advice (also in Mimnermus, Solon, and Theognis). In Solon the addressee may be an individual of whom a favor is requested and in Theognis, an *eromenos*, a friend, a poet/singer, a sailor, an enemy, and even a female slave.

The "you" plural signifies the clan, community, or citizens (as a whole or large portions of it), just as "we" does.

3. *Characters Other than Speaker and Addressee*

Archilochus:
Characters other than the speaker and the addressee—third person mode—appear in the singular six times. The "he" is: the brother-in-law lost at sea, 9.10; a soldier rejoicing at the possession of the speaker's shield (*Σαΐων τις*, 5.1); a member of the community (*τις ἀστῶν*, 13.1; *ἄλλοτε ἄλλος ἔχει τόδε*, 13.7; *οὐδείς*, 14.2); an ally (*ἐπίκουρος ἀνήρ*) who is considered a friend as long as he can fight, 15. "They" occurs four times and indicates: the lords of Euboea, famous for their expertise with the spear, 3.5; soldiers delivering injuries to the enemy, 6; members of the community (*ἑτέρους*, 13.9); mortals (*θνητοῖς*, 17).

Callinus:
"He" appears eight times and indicates: a young man/soldier (*τις*, 1.5, 1.9; *ἄνδρ᾽*, 1.13, 1.14; *ὁ μέν*, 1.16; *τὸν δ᾽*, 1.17; *ἀνδρός*, 1.18; *μιν*,

---

[46] That Cyrnus is less the exclusive recipient and more of a generic addressee is also suggested by the fact that many of the activities that Cyrnus is urged to pursue or avoid appear elsewhere in the third person, for instance:

Second person:	*πέπνυσο, μηδ᾽ αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπ᾽ ἔργμασι μηδ᾽ ἀδίκοισιν τιμὰς μηδ᾽ ἀρετὰς ἕλκεο μηδ᾽ ἄφενος* (29-30).
Third person:	*πᾶς δὲ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς Κύρνε δίκαιος ἐών* (148)
	εἰ δ᾽ ἀδίκως παρὰ καιρὸν ἀνὴρ φιλοκερδέι θυμῶι κτήσεται...αὖθις ἔγεντο κακόν (199-202).

1.20). “They” (twice): neighbors who deride idle young men, 1.2; the whole community admiring the brave soldiers, 1.18.

Tyrtaeus:
“He” occurs twenty times indicating: king Theopompus, 5.1; a man fighting, 10.2, 10.11, 10.31, 11.4, 11.16, 11.18, 11.21, 11.29, 11.33, 11.35, 12.16, 12.19, 12.20, 12.24; a member of the community, 12.39, a man of fighting age, 12.1; 12.14; 12.43; an enemy, 10.7. “They” (twenty-three times): the Lacedaemonians, 4.1, 4.5; the Lacedaemonian kings, 4.3; the Lacedaemonian gerousiasts, 4.5; the Lacedaemonians who fought the Messenian war, 5.6; the Messenians, 6, 7, 23.6; the Pamphyloi, Hylleis and Dymanes, 19.8; older men unable to fight, 10.19; young men, 10.27, 11.11; members of the community, 10.29, 10.29, 12.27, 12.37, 12.41; men unwilling to fight, 11.14; enemies, 12.12; descendants of brave soldiers, 12.29, 12.30; soldiers 19.13, 19.17.

Mimnermus:
“He” occurs sixteen times, signifying: man in general: 1.6; 5.7; a particular mythological figure: Tithonus, 4; Jason, 11.1, 11a; Pelias, 11.3; Helios, 11a.1, 12.1; Heos, 12.3, 12.10; a soldier displaying bravery, 14; a Paeonian officer leading his men, 17; someone involved in some activity: *ἄλλος*, 2.13, 2.15; *τις*, 2.15; *ἄλλος τις πολιτέων*, 7.2. “They” (three times): men in general, 1.5, 3; a group of soldiers, 13a.

Solon:
“He” appears twenty-six times and indicates: Critias and his father, 22a; a man involved in some activity, 11.5, 12.1, 13.5, 13.25, 13.29, 13.34, 13.37, 13.39, 13.41, 13.43, 13.43, 13.47, 13.50, 13.51, 13.53, 13.56, 13.60, 13.65, 13.67, 13.69, 13.73, 13.76, 15.4, 21, 24.1. “They” (twenty-six times): the Athenian citizens, 4.6, 4.21, 4.23, 4.30, 5.3, 10.1; leaders of the *demos*, 4.7; the members of the *demos*, 5.1, 6.1, 9.4; the Solians, 19.1; men in general, 6.4, 9.3, 13.9, 13.33, 13.63, 13.74, 14.1, 14.2, 17, 27; persons involved in some activity, 7.1, 13.11, 13.57, 14.2, 15.1.

Theognis: [47]
“He” occurs fifty times and indicates: low-born person, 69, 101, 102, 113, 151, 153, 189, 193; aristocrat: 71, 173, 186, 190, 195, 234;

[47] Using as a sample ll. 27-236.

someone (abstract) involved in some activity, 40, 58, 62, 65, 77, 91, 93, 95, 101, 117, 120, 121, 125, 133, 135, 139, 143, 147, 149,155, 160, 165, 167, 170, 181, 197, 199, 205, 207, 209, 214, 221, 225, 226, 227, 232. "They" (thirty-two times): men in general, 65, 68, 79, 84, 131, 150, 161, 172, 203, 227; low-born persons, 31, 35, 44, 49, 58, 59, 60, 105, 108, 109; aristocrats, 32, 35, 37, 41, 43, 57, 60, 111, 191, 220; the members of the *demos*, 45, 233.

The examination of the "he/she"s and "they"s above suggests that in archaic elegy the third person is mostly abstract, a quality reflected among all poets. Only a few instances of third person refer to specific individuals: the brother-in-law lost at sea (Archilochus); a particular man leading the Paeonians (Callinus); king Theopompus defeating the Messenians (Tyrtaeus); a brave man as well as a group of soldiers bringing themselves into a state of military readiness (Mimnermus); Critias and his father (Solon). Apart from these, the third person denotes either an individual abstractly (*τις*, *ἄλλος*, *ἀνήρ*, and such) or large groups, such as social classes, cities, and even humanity as a whole (*θνητοί*, *ἄνθρωποι*, and so on). The majority of concrete third person forms occur in a military context, which is understandable, since the nature of such narratives frequently demands mention of the leaders and soldiers distinguished by their bravery. In short, although the elegiac poets may focus on different thematic areas (military, political, philosophical) they all display a strong tendency toward the abstract presentation of character in the third person mode.

B. *Trimeters and Elegy: A Comparison*

1. *The Speaker (First Person)*

An examination of the first person in the trimeters suggests a distinct progression from a variable "I," in terms of profession, social status and outlook of life to a narrower and more consistent depiction. While in Archilochus and Semonides the first person may indicate a gnomic speaker, merchant, cook, physician, soothsayer, an officer, and possibly a female prostitute, in Solon and Hipponax it always reflects a specific person (political figure, Solon) or a character from a particular subculture (social underclass, Hipponax). Solon's presentation of the "I" comes from just two fragments of similar content, and one is justified in imagining an originally larger pool of characters, espe-

cially since his corpus gives us indications (frr. 38-40) that it may have been quite open thematically in the tradition of his iambic predecessors. Hipponax's extant corpus, on the other hand, inspires tolerable confidence that it is generally representative of the thematic breadth of the original poetry and that the narrow "I" we observe today is not much different from the one the poet conceived.

In elegy, as in the early trimeters, the first person reveals a wide diversity, since it may signify a human in the most inclusive sense, from member of the community and clan to gnomic speaker, chronicler of city history, soldier, public figure, political advocate, lover, symposiast, performer, tourist, caring uncle, female. An emphasis is given to the "I" as the voice of the community, the figure who contemplates the human condition and the relationship between the individual and his social surroundings. In such cases, the speaker reveals nothing personal: small intimations are typological rather than genuinely autobiographical.

The first person plural functions in a parallel way, in that in the first generation of iambic poets it signifies a diverse range of characters, from humans as a species and males as a gender to an abusive group of people, animals and, perhaps, mythological characters. In Hipponax, "we" appears only once, indicating the speaker and his sexual partner, which is quite in line with the thematic narrowing of his poetry. In elegy the first person plural indicates mostly humans abstractly, social classes and the community, but also the speaker's military company.

The early trimeters and elegy, then, present important similarities in terms of identity of the first person, since in both it may signify a variety of characters and also be gnomic and abstract. We observe neither of these elements in Hipponax.

2. *The Addressee (Second Person)*

In the trimeters before Hipponax, the second person singular reflects a variety of characters. In Archilochus and Semonides (there are no occurrences in Solon) it may indicate a target of abuse, a beloved young merchant, a physician's patient, a friend (host?) of the speaker, an *eromenos* (*παῖς*), a female ruler, and possibly even a mythological character. The elegies also present a wide breadth of addressees: a soldier, a named or unnamed companion of the speaker receiving gen-

eralized advice on important issues, a παῖς, a host (king Philocyprus), an enemy, a poet, a female slave.

The second person plural is absent in the trimeters of the first two generations; its only occurrence in Hipponax signifies the people of Clazomenae, in a context that is abusive (Bupalus is denounced as a murderer in front of the community). In the elegies the second person plural is always abstract, indicating either the clan or community, or young soldiers, men of age for service, or the citizens of a city, as a whole or as a particular class. In sum, "you" follows a path similar to that of "I:" diverse and often abstract in the early trimeters and elegy, while drastically restricted in Hipponax.

3. *Characters Other than the Speaker and Addressee*

In his trimeters Archilochus displays an inclination to present his male characters abstractly when they are the subject of the verb in the third person; when not, the context seems to be either abusive or sexual. In Semonides the third person is even more intensely impersonal, generally signifying either the human race as a whole or large parts of it. In Solon's trimeters "they" is the Athenian people in general or certain social classes. Similarly, in elegy, too, the third person is very often impersonal, its abstract character conveyed by expressions like τις, ἄλλος, ἀνήρ, or θνητοί, ἄνθρωποι, and so on. In contrast, Hipponax's consistency in the specificity of his characters creates a noticeable divergence from the tradition of generalizing, which before him had been shared by both the trimeters and elegy.

III. The Use of Person

The distribution of the person of the verb in the elegies, in number of verbs, is as follows (see Appendix IV for details)

	Arch.	Cal.	Tyrt.	Mimn.	Sol.	Thgn. (27-236)
I	8	-	2	5	12	3
You s.	4	2	-	1	7	53
He/She	7	8	46	22	66	49
We	4	-	8	4	5	4
You pl.	1	4	14	-	11	-
They	3	3	15	4	21	28
TOTAL	27	17	85	36	122	137

The following chart translates the one above into percentages of the occurrences of each person of the verb in comparison to the total number of verbs in each poet:

	Arch.	Cal.	Tyrt.	Mimn.	Sol.	Thgn.
I	29.5%	-	2.5%	14%	10%	2%
You s.	15.0%	12%	-	3%	6%	39%
He/She	26.0%	47%	54.0%	61%	54%	36%
We	15.0%	-	9.5%	11%	4%	3%
You pl.	3.5%	23%	16.5%	-	9%	-
They	11.0%	18%	17.5%	11%	17%	20%

The chart above points to certain trends in the elegies that suggest both similarities with and differences from the trimeters:[48]

a) Archilochus, in both his elegies and trimeters, makes the first person an important agent of action. In his elegies the "I" as subject of the verb occurs at the rate of 29.5%, which is twice as high as the second highest (found in Mimnermus). In the trimeters Archilochus' rate is even higher (35%), but surprisingly still below that of Solon (45%), which, however, comes from a very small corpus.

b) The trimeters in general reveal a stronger tendency to have the "I" as a subject of the verb than the elegies. Every iambic poet's rate is higher than any of the elegists except Archilochus.[49] Yet the "I" is widespread among the elegiac fragments as well: in Archilochus seven of his seventeen fragments contain a form of "I" (41%); in Tyrtaeus, six of his twenty-three (26%); in Mimnermus, six of his seventeen (35%); in Solon, fifteen of his thirty (50%). But despite the high percentage of elegiac fragments containing an "I," verbs in the first person command percentages much lower: 29.5% in Archilochus; 2.5% in Tyrtaeus; 14% in Mimnermus; 10% in Solon. This discrepancy may be explained by the fact that the trimeters more frequently contain narratives in which the "I" and "you" are active participants. The elegies, despite their thematic diversity, are more inclined to be

[49] For a chart of the trimeters, see Chapter Three, section "The Use of Person."

[50] For the statistical problems in Semonides generated by fr. 7, see the previous chapter. In the extant corpus his rate is 6%, but in a more representative selective sampling it rises to 18%. Solon: 45%; Hipponax: 18%.

generalizations in the third person. This tendency toward abstraction in the third person is also observed in the early trimeters.

c) The second person presents us with a situation similar to that of the first: in Archilochus' elegies, for instance, five of his seventeen fragments contain a "you" in the singular (29%); yet only 15% of the verbs appear in this person. But we must recall that many of the addressees are recipients of gnomic advice and their presence functions simply as a literary device that provides the speaker with an opportunity to offer his thoughts and advice. When a verb in the second person does occur in the elegies, it appears, as a rule, in the hortatory or imperative mood: five out of five in Archilochus; two out of six in Callinus; nine out of fourteen in Tyrtaeus; one out of one in Mimnermus; eight out of eighteen in Solon; thirty-six out of fourty-nine in Theognis. By contrast, the rate of second person verbs in the hortatory or the imperative mood is much lower in the trimeters: six out of twenty-six in Archilochus; three out of four in Semonides;[50] two out of ten in Hipponax. The trimeters, then, are less admonitory as compared to the elegies.

In closing we may observe that the elegies generally make heavy use of the third person singular, which is used abstractly, while the first and second persons recede into the background with a varying degree of intensity from poet to poet. Ironically, Hipponax, who departs drastically from the traditions of the earlier trimeters (closely related with the elegies in a number of ways), seems to be nearest to the elegiac patterns in this respect. Yet the fundamental difference between his poetry on the one hand and the elegies and the trimeters of his predecessors on the other is that it uses the third person with a specificity and concreteness that bears little resemblance to the generalizing pronouncements of the other poets.

IV. The Use of Diction

A. *Verbs*

In this section we examine verbs denoting feeling, attitude, cognition and perception as opposed to verbs of plain physical action in the

[51] All three occur in one passage (fr. 10a).

same way as we examined them in the trimeters in Chapter Three. The elegiac poets' interest in the interior or exterior aspects of their characters is realized through the use of appropriate diction, which in the case of the verbs is as follows (see Appendix V for details):

	Feeling/Cognition	Physical Action
Archilochus	12	13
Callinus	8	7
Tyrtaeus	33	31
Mimnermus	11	19
Solon	48	56
Theognis[52]	92	34

The distribution between the two categories is very balanced down to Theognis, whose paraenetic discourse emphasizes heavily the importance of his addressee's alertness, awareness and perception regarding the changing environment in which the aristocrats find themselves in the middle/later part of the sixth century. In general, verbs of action in the elegies primarily denote activity in the public domain, often military. A comparison with the trimeters suggests that the distribution of the two categories of verbs is quite comparable. In the first generation of the elegiac and iambic poets the rate of verbs of attitude, cognition and perception in relationship to verbs of physical action is almost identical in both genres (53/51 in elegy versus 75/68 in the trimeters). The rates of the second generation are also quite similar: 59/75 in Mimnermus and Solon versus 9/14 in (iambic) Solon. A major divergence between the two genres occurs in the third generation, since Theognis focuses on verbs of attitude, perception and cognition while Hipponax concentrates on verbs of physical action. In the latter poet the rate of verbs of physical action is almost four and a half times higher than that of verbs of attitude/perception, which is unparalleled in any of the other poets. The matter-of-factness that characterizes his poetry at various levels finds another expression through the use of verbs that underline the exterior elements of his characters rather than their more interior aspects.

[52] Using as a sample ll. 27-236.

B. *Nouns*

In this section we examine, as we examined earlier in the trimeters, the depiction of a more abstract or more universalist world in the elegies through the use of abstract nouns, as opposed to "tangible" and "perceptible" nouns. In this respect, the elegiac poets present us with the following distribution (see Appendix VI for details):

	Intangibles	Man-made	Natural	Physical Action
Archilochus	20	19	9	3
Callinus	14	7	4	-
Tyrtaeus	101	48	52	6
Mimnermus	57	16	32	4
Solon	173	32	59	5
Theognis	167	26	32	4

In the first generation of elegists there correspond 1.8 "intangibles" for every "man-made" noun (135/74), a rate that suggests that the former type of nouns is used less frequently at this period than in the second and third generations, during which there correspond 5.4 "intangibles" (397/74) for every "man-made" noun. A factor accounting for this difference is that in their treatment of military themes the early elegiac poets make frequent use of nouns denoting military paraphernalia. With the reduction of military themes in Mimnermus, Solon, and Theognis, the rate of "man-made" nouns falls dramatically. In the trimeters, in the iambic poets of the first two generations, the rate of "man-made" nouns in relationship to "intangible" nouns is generally comparable with that of the elegies of the same period. In Hipponax, however, this type of distribution is no longer observed, shattered by the reduction of "intangibles" and at the same time the striking rise of the artifactual nouns. While a number of "man-made" nouns in the earlier trimeters refer to public space, in Hipponax the vast majority reflects objects connected with a domestic setting. Last, while in elegy and the earlier trimeters, artifactual nouns are used also in figurative speech (for instance, Sol. 5.5, 37.8, Thgn. 233), in Hipponax such uses are generally absent.

Let us recapitulate the chapter. In terms of themes, elegy presents a number of affinities with the trimeters of all four iambic poets (food,

wine drinking, references to distant lands, and so on). The most important thematic link between the two genres, however, is the presence in both of them of serious reflection on gnomic or socio-political issues. This crucial element is nevertheless absent from Hipponax, who thus deviates from this common tradition and sets himself apart from both elegy and his iambic predecessors.

An examination of the identity of character suggests that the early trimeters and elegy show strong similarities in this area, too: the "I" is both abstract and diverse, and so is the "you." The third person is also used abstractly. But, again, Hipponax displays a strong tendency toward differentiation through his persistent depiction of specific characters in a confined social context.

In terms of use of the person of the verb, the trimeters generally employ higher rates of verbs in the first and second person than the elegies, despite the widespread presence in the latter of pronouns in these persons or nouns in the vocative. This may be explained by the fact that the early trimeters, in addition to their gnomic addresses, also contain narratives in which the "I" and "you" are specific characters interacting with each other. Hipponax, with his concentration on the third person, is closer to the elegiac patterns, but his insistence on specific and not generalizing depiction renders him different from his iambic predecessors and also the elegists.

Elegy and the early trimeters present a rather abstract reality: the rates of verbs of feeling, attitude, perception and cognition as well as of "intangible" nouns are much higher than those of Hipponax, who depicts the world with an unusual externality and concreteness.

CHAPTER FIVE

INSCRIPTIONS, LATER IAMBUS AND TRAGEDY

Our study so far has shown that while the trimeters of Archilochus, Semonides and Solon present strong affinities with archaic elegy, the poetry of Hipponax is different, because it reduces drastically some important “elegiac” elements. Whether this reduction is simply associated with the individual character of Hipponax’s poetry or is the result of a more profound change in the trimeters cannot be determined solely through the study of archaic iambic poetry. Since Hipponax is the only surviving iambic poet of his generation, we do not know whether contemporaries of his write in a similar vein—which, of course, would suggest a general thematic narrowing of iambic poetry by the third quarter of the sixth century. Further pursuit of the issue, therefore, must involve information from outside archaic iambus.

The purpose of this chapter is to show that there is indeed such evidence, which corroborates the notion that the differences observed in Hipponax reflect a more general tendency in iambic meter. We will examine two areas that can contribute to our picture of the trajectory of later iambus: a) the archaic metric epitaphs and dedications, that is, epigraphic material with strong elegiac tendencies (serious subject matter),[1] and b) the iambic poets who are later than Hipponax. If our theory is correct, about the time of Hipponax we should expect to find few if any epitaphs or dedications in iambic meter; in addition, the post-Hipponactean iambic poets should show few if any elegiac traits.

[1] We exclude here the examination of *Tituli Varii* because their subject matter, although on occasion similar to that of the epitaphs and dedications, is more playful, that is, closer to “iambic” themes. Inscriptions in this category may appear on an oenochoe (432), a crater (443), a cotyle (447), a cup (450, 454), a cylix (460), a lamp (463). The context varies widely: cf. h*ὸς νῦν ὀρχεστõν πάντον ἀταλότατα παίζει, / τõ τόδε κλ|μιν* (*sic*) *vacat* (432); *καλõ Παντέλεος* h*α ποτερία καλά* (450); *Σατέλης ποτὲ καλώς* (*sic*)· *ἐβά⟨σ⟩κηνένιν ὁ* μ*άν*[*τις*] (455); *ὡς λύχνον εἰμὶ καὶ φαίνω θε*[*οῖσ*]*ιν καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν* (463). All numbers in this note reflect the CEG enumeration.

As is so frequently the case in early literature, the epigraphic material is very sparse, especially in the earlier periods, and so is the corpus of iambic poetry postdating Hipponax. Limited as they are, however, they still provide us with valuable information because they create a context in the light of which we may better understand the changes we see in the archaic trimeters.

Finally, having examined the areas in which iambic poetry is no longer found, we will consider a possible reason for its retreat.

I. The Meter of the Archaic Metric Inscriptions

Dover[2] presents the metrical changes in archaic epitaphs and dedicatory inscriptions as follows:

Eighth century-560	Everything in hexameter
560-540	Simultaneous presence of both elegiac and iambic meters.[3] The dominance of hexameter collapses.
540-Later	Dominance of elegiac.

Illustrating his point in a footnote, Dover mentions only one iambic epitaph and one iambic dedication for the period 560-540 B.C.E. Since his article was written more than forty years ago and the discussion is very brief, a more detailed look into the meter of archaic metric inscriptions is in order. The collection used is P. A. Hansen's *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca* (*CEG*1 and *CEG*2), which for the purposes of this study was deemed the most focused and complete.[4] The source used

[2] Dover 1963: 194-5.

[3] Bowie 1993: 5: "Among early inscribed texts, whether sepulchral or dedicatory, hexameters are used first and then outnumber elegiac couplets until the late sixth century." Our examination confirms Bowie's statement; see below.

[4] Virtually all the material of P. Friedlaender and H. Hoffleit's *Epigrammata* (1948) is contained in *CEG* and also in W. Peek's massive *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* (1955). Peek's *Attische Vers-Inschriften* (1980) covers a very wide period (sixth century B.C.E.-fifth century C.E.), but the earliest iambic inscription is dated to the first half of the fourth century B.C.E. (119). The material appearing in R. Merkelbach and J. Stauber's *Steinepigramme Aus dem Griechischen Osten* is substantially covered by the two volumes of *CEG* and the subsequent issues of *SEG*. We have adhered to Hansen's classification when his judgment diverges from the author's own,

for the period after the publication of *CEG*2 is *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (*SEG*), volumes 39-49 (1989-1999). Following Hansen's division, we examine inscriptions down to ca. 400, a date sufficiently late for the documentation of the epigraphic trajectory.[5] All lists and charts below are based on *CEG*; the epigram numbers also refer to the same collection. Since Attica is represented by a disproportionally large number of inscriptions in comparison to other places, it is considered separately. We should note here that inscriptions preserved in the manuscript tradition are not considered, regardless of the likelihood of their having been incised in the sixth or fifth centuries.[6]

Concerning the chronological classification of the inscriptions, the period under consideration has been divided into twenty-five-year periods according to the dates provided by *CEG*. As is well known, however, precise dating cannot be secured, and therefore the division offered here should be taken only as approximate (cf. also Hansen's cautionary approach, according to which most dates are preceded by the "circa" designation and followed by a question mark). The chronological layout of the inscriptions, then, should be understood to be flexible and suggestive rather than rigid and definitive.

---

as in the case of *IG* 3 1259 (*Βύλο τὸ σε̃μα τοῦτ' Ἐλιονίδο*, Attica ca. 525-500), which, although almost completely iambic, is omitted by *CEG*, perhaps because the scanning of the last word is slightly irregular (*contra* Peek). On occasion, it is difficult to decipher the metrical intention of the epigram, especially since there is always the obvious possibility that the composer aims for an iambic but on the way makes a slip or that the inscription has been poorly preserved.

[5] Hansen's break in 400 B.C.E. has been criticized by Day 1985: 375 as a "rather artificial terminus," since private Attic sepulchral monuments virtually cease to exist ca. 490, only to resume in the 430's, at which point they have more affinities with those of the fourth century than with the archaic ones.

[6] It is quite probable that certain epigrams from the "*Simonidea*" (text and commentary in Page 1981: 186-302), were inscriptional, although their dating remains problematic. But generally the distinction between what was inscribed and what was a literary epigram is uncertain. We must note that of the eighty-nine epigrams attributed to Simonides, the vast majority is in elegiac. Epigr. 33b, a signature-epigram which is "mere graffiti" (Page 1981: 246), is in iambic meter (*Κίμων ἔγραψε τὴν θύραν τὴν δεξιάν, / τὴν δ' ἐξιόντων δεξιὰν Διονύσιος*), and so is epigr. 58 (*τὸν ἐν Ῥόδωι κολοσσὸν ὀκτάκις δέκα / Χάρης ἐποίει πηχέων ὁ Λίνδιος*).

A. *Epitaphs*

1. *Attica*[7]

730-600	None.
600-575	None.
575-550	*Hexameter*: 16; *elegiac*: 13, 14; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*:[8] 15.
550-525	*Hexameter*: 35[9], 36, 40; *elegiac*: 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31,[10] 32, 34; *iambic*: 26;[11] *dactylic*: 20, 470.
525-500	*Hexameter*: 47, 53, 55, 59, 62, 64, 71; *elegiac*: 39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 61, 66, 67, 68, 69; *iambic*:[12] 49; *dactylic*: 43, 45, 65.
500-475	*Hexameter*: none; *elegiac*: 2, 3, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79; *iambic*: 70; *dactylic*: 1, 73.
475-400	*Hexameter*: 83, 84; *elegiac*: 4, 5, 6, 7,[13] 8, 10, 11, 12, 80, 81, 86, 87, 89,[14] 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 102, 103, 104, 105; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: 9, 82, 85, 88, 100, 101, 472.

---

[7] Inscriptions the meter of which is indeterminate and therefore not included in the lists above: 17, 22, 23, 29, 30, 33, 37, 60, 63, 72, 471.

[8] The category of "Dactylic" indicates an inscription that is unidentifiable as to whether it is in hexameters or elegiac couplets.

[9] This single hexameter line, like many others classified as "Hexameter," in theory could be either a single hexameter inscription, part of an elegiac couplet or part of a longer epigram in hexameters. The layout and content, however, suggest that it was intended as a single hexameter. Friedlaender and Hoffleit make a distinction between one-line hexameter epigrams and longer epigrams in hexameters.

[10] Plus a one-line signature in hexameter.

[11] 38, which has a number of iambic feet, is irregular *pace* Wallace 1984: 306.

[12] Also 56?

[13] Although only one verse survives, it almost certainly comes from an elegiac couplet, since public inscriptions in fifth century Athens are always in this metric form. I owe this point as well as a number of others in this section to Julia Lougovaya.

[14] Plus one line in hexameter.

CHART I

Epitaphs (Attica)

	Hexameter	Elegaic	Iambic	Dactylic	Total
730-600					
600-575					
575-550	1	2		1	4
550-525	3	10	1	2	16
525-500	7	17	1	3	28
500-475		8	1	2	11
475-400	2	27		7	36

2. *Outside of Attica*[15]

730-600	*Hexameter*: 132, 143, 144, 145, 152, 165; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: none;[16] *dactylic*: none.
600-575	*Hexameter*: 109, 137; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.
575-550	*Hexameter*: 146; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.[17]
550-525	*Hexameter*: 138, SEG 48.1067; *elegiac*: SEG 41.540; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.
525-500	*Hexameter*: 106; *elegiac*: 136, 158, 159, 169, SEG 49.505; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: 128, 157.
500-475	*Hexameter*: 110, 114, 116, 139, 150, 163, SEG 42.449; *elegiac*: 111, 112, 113, 127, 131, 134, 148, 155, 161, 172, 173, SEG 48.1170; *iambic*: 151, 162, 663; *dactylic*: 107, 160.
475-400	*Hexameter*: 118, 119, 122, 124, 125, 129, 130, 133, 166, 178, SEG48.1124; *elegiac*: 115, 117, 120, 123, 135, 141, 142, 147, 149, 153, 154, 167, 170, 175; 637, 727, 728; *iambic*: 121, SEG 40.808; *dactylic*: 108, 126, 156, 171, 174, 176, 177, 638.

[15] Indeterminate: 168 (dactylic?), 652, 710. SEG 41.413 is irregular. SEG 43.695 in hexameters is dated as "6th century."

[16] In 140 one can extract at least four iambic feet, but the middle of the line can also be taken as two dactylic feet.

[17] 164 may be dactylic, but the meter is indeterminate.

CHART II

Epitaphs (Outside of Attica)

	Hexameter	Elegaic	Iambic	Dactylic	Total
730-600	6				6
600-575	2				2
575-550	1				1
550-525	2	1			3
525-500	1	5		2	8
500-475	7	12	3	2	24
475-400	11	17	2	8	38

B. *Dedications*

1. *Attica*[18]

730-600 *Hexameter*: 287, 288; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.

600-575 *Hexameter*: 180, 181, 182, 281; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.

575-550 *Hexameter*: 183, 184, 185, 299, 282, 291, 301; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.[19]

550-525 *Hexameter*: 186, 187, 188, 290; *elegiac*: 190, 304; *iambic*: 302; *dactylic*: 289, 303.

525-500 *Hexameter*: 189, 191, 195, 193, 198, 203, 206, 211, 214, 217, 220, 221, 224; *elegiac*: 179, 194, 196, 197, 200, 202, 205,[20] 207, 210, 215, 218, 293, 305, 306; *iambic*: 209;[21] *dactylic*: 201, 292.

500-475 *Hexameter*: 226, 227, 232, 239, 240, 250, 256, 259, 260, 267, 283, 285, 295, 297, 298; *elegiac*: 225, 230, 231, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 242, 243, 244, 248, 251, 252, 253, 254, 258, 263, 266, 268, 269, 270, 284,

---

[18] Inscriptions the meter of which is indeterminate and therefore not included in the lists above: 199, 204, 208, 212, 213, 216, 219, 222, 223, 228, 245, 249, 255, 264, 265, 294, 296, 307.

[19] 300 may also be dactylic.

[20] A couplet and a signature.

[21] "An unsuccessful trimeter," according to Friedlaender and Hoffleit. 192 consists of two lines: the first is dactylic; the second "signature" line is iambic.

	286, 308, 309, 311, 312, 313; *iambic*: 247;[22] *dactylic*: 241, 246, 257, 261, 271, 310.
475-400	*Hexameter*: 314, 318, 315, 743 (i), 745; *elegiac*: 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 278, 279a, 280, 280a, 316, 317, 320; *iambic*: none;[23] *dactylic*: 277, 279, 319, 742, 744.

CHART III

Dedications (Attica)

	Hexameter	Elegaic	Iambic	Dactylic	Total
730-600	2				2
600-575	4				4
575-550	6				7
550-525	4	2	1	2	9
525-500	13	14	1	2	30
500-475	15	30	1	6	52
475-400	5	12		5	22

2. Outside of Attica[24]

730-600	*Hexameter*: 326, 357, 363, 403, 404, 813; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: 401,[25] 402(i);[26] *dactylic*: 352.
600-575	*Hexameter*: 333, 344, 348, 353, 355, 358, 368, 369, 412, 427; *elegiac*: none; *iambic*: 411; *dactylic*: 354.
575-550	*Hexameter*: 359, 422; *elegiac*: 362; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.
550-525	*Hexameter*: 327, 334, 335, 345, 366, 370, 371, 372, 391, 398, 423, 424, 425, 426; *elegiac*: 336, 373, 415, 418; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: none.

---

[22] Also 229? In addition to 247, there is another inscription that, however, is not only fragmentary but also very short and, most important, refers to the dedicator and craftsman: [x - ἐ]*ποίε κἀνέθεκε*: *τε̃ι θεõι*, 262.

[23] 321 consists of two lines (the first, in *oratione soluta*, according to Hansen). The second ("signature") line is in iambic.

[24] Inscriptions the meter of which is indeterminate and therefore not included in the lists above: 394, 406, 408, 831.

[25] "*Metrum iambicum in dubium vocare non licet*," Hansen 1983: 220.

[26] The first part of the inscription (402 i) "*scenarios praebuisse videtur*," Hansen 1983: 220; the second (402 ii), in hexameters.

525-500	*Hexameter*: 337, 338, 360, 374, 405; *elegiac*: 321a, 379, 392, 396, 410, 413, 414, 416, 839a; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: 375, 376, 419, 420.
500-475	*Hexameter*: 325, 328, 329, 364, 377, 384, 397; *elegiac*: 322, 331, 346, 349, 367, 380, 381, 407, 429; *iambic*: 330; *dactylic*: 840, 842.
475-400	*Hexameter*: 323, 339, 340, 341, 361, 378, 388, 399, 400, 417; *elegiac*: 324, 332, 342, 343, 347, 350, 351, 365, 382, 383, 385, 386, 387, 389, 390, 393, 409, 421, 428, 785, 787, 833, 857; *iambic*: none; *dactylic*: 356, 395, 808, 832, 867.

CHART IV

Dedications (Outside of Attica)

	Hexameter	Elegaic	Iambic	Dactylic	Total
730-600	6		2	1	9
600-575	10		1	1	12
575-550	2	1			3
550-525	14	4			18
525-500	5	9		4	18
500-475	7	9	1	2	19
475-400	10	23		5	38

C. *Summary of Inscriptions*

CHART V

Summary of Iambus (All Places)

	Epitaphs	Dedications	Total	%
730-600	-/6	2/11	2/17	11.8
600-575	-/2	1/16	1/18	5.6
575-550	-/5	-/10	-/15	-
550-525	1/19	1/27	2/46	4.3
525-500	1/36	1/48	2/84	2.4
500-475	4/35	2/71	6/106	5.6
475-400	2/74	-/60	2/134	1.5

The numerator indicates the number of inscriptions in iambic meter; the denominator, the number of all inscriptions.

CHART VI

Summary of Elegiacs (All Places)

	Epitaphs	Dedications	Total	%
730-600	-/6	-/11	-/17	
600-575	-/2	-/16	-/18	
575-550	2/5	1/10	3/15	20.0
550-525	11/19	6/27	17/46	37.0
525-500	22/36	23/48	45/84	53.6
500-475	20/35	39/71	59/106	55.7
475-400	44/74	35/60	79/134	58.9

The numerator indicates the number of elegiac inscriptions; the denominator, the number of all inscriptions.

D. *Observations*

In the first part of the sixth century and earlier, the iambic inscriptions represent a higher ratio of the total inscriptions than they do thereafter. The small number of early inscriptions may account for the occasional gaps, like that of 575-550, in which no epitaph or dedication appears in iambic meter. Since the smaller the numbers involved the larger the risk of misrepresentation, we may consolidate the numbers from the earliest inscription down to 550: the ratio is 3/50 (6.0%), which is quite a bit higher than the collective percentage between 550 and 400 (12/370, that is, 3.2%). By the same token, we notice a meteoric rise of the elegiac inscriptions: while down to 575 we have no evidence of them at all and in the period 575-550 only three occurrences (20.0%), from this point on the increase is both progressive and spectacular. The elegiacs now become the undisputed dominant meter in the epitaphs and dedications, while at the same time the importance of the iambics is significantly reduced.

If we consolidate the fractions iambic/elegiac for the period 730-550, we end up with the ratio 3/3: the iambic inscriptions are as fre-

quent as the elegiac ones. It is possible, of course, that a number of the unidentifiable dactylic verses may belong to elegiac couplets; the ratio is a good indication, however, that in the earlier part of the sixth century iambic inscriptions are used with considerably higher frequently than later. If the topics of iambic poetry become narrower somewhere in the 530's or a little earlier, we should expect a low ratio of iambics after this point, which, in fact, is the case (12/200, that is, .06). The anomalous higher percentage of iambics in the period 500-475 may be an accident of preservation. We may conclude, then, that around the middle of the sixth century an important change takes place with respect to the uses of iambic inscriptions, namely the perception that they are less appropriate to express the spirit of epitaphs and dedications.[27] The major vehicle for this kind of poetry now is the elegiac couplet. An excellent example of this tendency is Page epigr. 1 (also 430 *CEG*):

> *ἦ μέγ' Ἀθηναίοισι φόως γένεθ', ἡνίκ' Ἀριστο-*
> *γείτων Ἵππαρχον κτεῖνε καὶ Ἁρμόδιος·*

The name *Ἀριστογείτων* does not fit into a dactylic verse, but certainly fits in iambic. The composer nevertheless preferred to break the name into two lines rather than use the iambic meter.

One must, however, acknowledge the view that the choice of meter in early epigrams is at least partially influenced by considerations regarding the proper names that are contained in the inscriptions.[28] Some

---

[27] Cf. also the five-line epigr. 35: it starts with an elegiac couplet, but then reverts to iambic. Page 1981: 250: "There is no reason for the eccentricity of metre, unless it be that the composer found iambics easier for his colourless enumeration of victories at the four Great Games." The fact that the composer begins with elegiacs, despite his change of heart on the way, is a clear indication that his intention was to use this meter. Revealing is also Critias fr. 4, in which the poet explicitly states that his desire to use the elegiac is impeded by the metrical difficulties of the name "Alcibiades:" *οὐ γάρ πως ἦν τοὔνομ' ἐφαρμόζειν ἐλεγείωι / νῦν δ' ἐν ἰαμβείωι κείσεται οὐκ ἀμέτρως*. It is also noteworthy that three post-525 iambic epigrams are iambic only as signatures. All three are dedications and come from Athens: 192 (ca. 520) consists of two parts (lines), the first of which is a hexameter ([-*υ υ -υ υ -υ Ἀθεναί*]*αι ἀνάκειμα*[*ι*].), while the second part (line), which is the sculptor's signature ([x - *υ* -]*νες Εὐμάρες* [*ἐργάσα*]*το*), is iambic. In epigr. 321 (ca. 400), the first line (*Ἀρχέδημος ὁ Θ*|*ηραῖος ὁ νυμφ*|*όληπτος*) is in *oratione soluta*, while the second part (*φραδ*|*αῖσι νυμφῶν τ*|*ἄντρον ἐξηργ*|*άξατο*) in iambics. In 262 (ca. 480) the name is missing but the line is clearly a signature (x – *ἐποίε κἀνέθεκε τε̃ι θεõι*), also in iambic.

[28] See Wallace 1970: 95-105 and 1984: 303-15. In the fifth and fourth centuries, especially in funerary epigrams, the name is often in the prose that precedes the verse epitaph.

names either do not fit into dactylic meter or are more easily managed in iambic, although workable alternatives to the use of iambic are not impossible.[29] We may conclude here that while before the middle of the sixth century iambus is a perfectly legitimate vehicle for the treatment of serious subject matter such as funerary epigrams and dedications, afterwards its importance is diminished. Serious reflection, which once was a large part of the iambic repertory, now is quite absent from its ranks, whereas it is found more and more frequently in the elegiacs.

II. The Later Iambic Poets

The poetry of Hipponax is thematically narrower than that of his iambic predecessors primarily because it is free of serious subject matter. Whether this narrowing becomes a consistent characteristic of iambus after the middle of the sixth century or not can be tested by examining the poetries of other iambic poets who follow him chronologically: if they, too, abstain from serious themes we can argue that the narrowing that we observe in Hipponax is not simply a personal trait of the poet, but the reflection of a new phase in the development of iambus.

This section examines the iambic poetry between the time of Hipponax and the end of the fifth century. The poets whose iambic fragments survive and who will be considered are: Ananius, Demodocus, Anacreon, Susarion, Euclides, Hermippus, Timocreon, Euenus, Scythinus, Panarces and Diphilus.[30]

---

[29] In epigr. 26 it is not impossible to fit the names of Archias and Eucosmides into dactylic feet (for instance, in the genitive case and before a word that starts with a vowel), but it is rather hard. Epigr. 49, in iambic, contains the name *Μυρίνη*, which has a scanning long-short-long; cf., however, epigr. 93, which manages to incorporate the same name twice in an elegiac epitaph. Thanks to Julia Lougovaya for pointing this out to me.

[30] Since the later iambic corpus is extremely small, this section considers all iambic meters. Dates and fragment numbers for all poets are based on West 1998. The iambic adespota (frr. 1-62), which appear in various meters, are not considered here due to the uncertainty of their dating (some of them are attributed to Archilochus, Hipponax, and Anacreon).

A. *The Poets*

1. *Ananius (sixth century)* [31]

Gold/Desire for: In fr. 2 the poet has Pythermus say that gold is the most important thing; in fr. 3, which may come from the same poem, there is a response, according to which hungry people prefer figs to gold.

Food: In fr. 3 Ananius mentions figs twice, the point being that a full stomach is to be preferred to gold; in fr. 4 the speaker swears by cabbage (*ναὶ μὰ τὴν κράμβην*). In fr. 5 Ananius offers us a stunning ten-line list of fruits, meats and fish (*χρόμιος, ἀνθίης, καρὶς ἐκ συκέης φύλλου, χιμαίρης κρέας, δέλφακος, κυνῶν, λαγῶν, ἀλωπέκων, οἰός, θύννος, ἐν μυσσωτῶι, βοῦς πιανθείς*) and the best season of the year for each to be consumed.

Prayer: In Anan. fr. 1 the speaker prays to Apollo to come to him (*Ἄπολλον, ὅς που Δῆλον ἢ Πυθῶν' ἔχεις... ἵκεο*). The words "come to your temple or" (uncertain text) seem to be "a jocular reference to the risk of being scalped by the Scythians."[32]

2. *Demodocus of Leros (sixth century?)*

Reference to Bias: The only surviving iambic line by Demodocus (fr. 6) is the textually uncertain *ἢν τύχῃς †τήνων δικάζεο τὴν Πριηνίην δίκην* which Diogenes Laertius preserves in the context of his treatment of Bias the Prienian. Noteworthy, however, is Laertius' reference in the same breath to Hipponax, who, too, mentions Bias in a one-line tetrameter: *καὶ δικάζεσθαι Βίαντος τοῦ Πριηνέως κρέσσον* (123).[33]

3. *Anacreon of Teos (sixth-fifth centuries)*

Sexual Themes: In Anacr. 5 the speaker is a female who, with words containing sexual overtones (*κνυζῇ, πέπειρα, μαργοσύνην*), confesses that she is overcome with lust for the addressee. Fr. 7 makes a reference to the wedding chamber where an enemy has become not the

---

[31] Date and origin uncertain; generally Ananius is understood as belonging to the sixth century, but he is later than Hipponax.

[32] Gerber 1999: 505.

[33] It is of interest that Demodocus' two surviving elegiac fragments have at least a lighthearted, if not outright abusive, flavor.

husband but the wife (*καὶ θάλαμος / οὗ κεῖνος οὐκ ἔγημεν ἀλλ' ἐγήματο*). The lines, mocking his lack of manliness, are clearly abusive.

Domestic/Private Life: Fr. 1 is Anacreon's only surviving trimeter and comes from the direct speech of someone who is receiving some travelers: *ἔστε ξένοισι μειλίχοις ἐοικότες / στέγης τε μοῦνον καὶ πυρὸς κεχρημένοις*. Anacr. fr. 6 again depicts a domestic scene: a male is sleeping quietly with the doors unlocked.

Death: The speaker in fr. 2 expresses his grief for a fallen young soldier.

Old Age: Fr. 3 mentions black and white hairs (*εὖτέ μοι λευκαὶ μελαίναις ἀναμεμίξονται τρίχες*). Since the fragment consists only of a temporal clause, we are not in a position to retrieve its meaning. This progression toward white hair may indicate a stage in man's life viewed perhaps from the point of one's erotic desirability, as in fr. 358 *PMG*. Old age as lovelessness is one of the *topoi* in Anacreon's poetry, but it is impossible to tell whether this is the theme here as well.

Uncertain: The speaker in fr. 4 describes himself in a state of confusion (*αἱ δέ μεο φρένες ἐκκεκωφέαται*). We do not know the cause of this mental numbness, but in another (lyric) poem in which Anacreon refers to a similar condition (*φρένας ἐπτοέαται*, 346.12 *PMG*) the reason is love. Perhaps here, too, the context is erotic, but it remains uncertain.

4. *Susarion of Megara (sixth or fifth century)*

Invective: In his only surviving fragment, Susarion claims that women represent an evil (*κακὸν γυναῖκες*).[34] Tzetzes, *Prol. in Ar.* (p. 26.78 Koster), understands these lines as abuse, *σκῶμμα*, and associates the poet with the invention of the so-called "first comedy" (*ἡ πρώτη κωμῳδία*). The very opening of the poem (*ἀκούετε λεῴ*) may be an allusion to Hipponax (fr. 1) addressing the people of Clazomenae.[35]

---

[34] Tzetzes provides us with the reason of Susarion's assault on women: his wife left him. The information must have been contained in the poem.

[35] The allusion is much stronger if indeed Callim. fr. 191.1 Pf. (*ἀκούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος, οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω*) comes from Hipponax, as is likely.

5. *Euclides of Athens (fifth century, perhaps earlier)*

Invective: In frr. 1 and 2 the speaker's encounter with Epichares on his way to Marathon and his attempt not to provoke his wrath (*οὐκ ἄν γ' ἀράμενος τὸν ἐκείνου ἐλλέβορον*) suggests some kind of invective content: *ἐλλέβορος* (hellebore) was a proverbially bitter medicine, and the fact that the speaker uses it to refer to Epichares' disposition points toward an unflattering portrait of him. Aristotle, who quotes the lines (*Poet.* 1458a34), notes that there is humor in the poem: *καὶ γὰρ μεταφοραῖς καὶ γλώτταις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις εἴδεσι χρώμενος* (i.e., Euclides) *ἀπρεπῶς καὶ ἐπίτηδες ἐπὶ τὰ γελοῖα αὐτὸ ἂν ἀπεργάσαιτο.*

6. *Hermippus of Athens*[36] *(fifth century)*

Sexual Themes: In fr. 5 the first of the two lines is textually uncertain, but *κασαλβάζουσαν* in the second line signifies a woman who teases sexually.[37] In fr. 2 the reference to a fig tree (*τὰς λευκερινεὼς δὲ χωρὶς ἰσχάδας*) may have sexual and abusive connotations as well; especially since the figs are depicted as white, the sexual allusions are even more probable (*λευκός* is "a standard epithet of pathics"[38]).

Low Class/Profession: In fr. 3 the subject is the construction methods of a builder; the passage is detailed enough even to mention an *ὑπαγωγεύς*, a tool of the trade.

Scatology (?): In its present form fr. 6 is unintelligible (*καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους †τὸν πρωνός τις ὤν*). Hartung has suggested the restoration *καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους κοπρῶνος ὥς τις ὢν κεβλήπυρις.*

Invective: In fr. 4 the speaker tells us that he has arrived on foot at the plain of the Cylicranes and sees the city of Heracleia (at the foot of mount Oeta). Athenaeus (461e) informs us that the poem is abusive (*οὓς χλευάζων Ἕρμιππος...φησίν*).

7. *Timocreon of Rhodes (earlier fifth century).*

Invective (?): Fr. 7 refers to the valor of the Milesians in the days of old (*πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι*). The line seems to make a conscious contrast between the past and the present and insinuates that

[36] Both a comic and iambic poet.
[37] Cf. Rosen 1988b: 10-11.
[38] Henderson 1975: 211.

the Milesians now are cowards, a remark in the tradition of abuse.[39] Fr. 10 has as its target the Ceans, who presumably had developed a reputation for garrulity (*φλυαρία*). The poem is witty and amusing, in that Timocreon makes a joke at their expense by expressing his assessment in a repetitive way, obviously practicing the Ceans' own flaw to humorous effect.

8. *Euenus (fifth century).*

Philosophical: The poet survives in just one line (*σοφώτατόν τοι κἀμαθέστατον χρόνος*, 9a), coming from a poem in which, according to the quoting source, Euenus combines the concepts of Simonides and Paron the Pythagorean about time. The line has a philosophical flavor, but the context is missing. In fr. 10 the testimonia inform us of the poet's statement that fire is the best of sauces (*ἡδυσμάτων κράτιστον*, Plut. *quaest. Plat.* 10.3), but the expression seems to have been used in a non-culinary context.

9. *Scythinus (fifth/fourth centuries?)*

Uncertain: There is only one trochaic fragment extant, which mentions Apollo, in what seems to be a serious manner.[40]

10. *Panarces (date uncertain)*

Riddles: Athenaeus (452c) tells us that Clearchus in his treatise *On Riddles* includes one by Panarces. The schol. *ad Plat. Resp.* 5.479b-c gives the riddle, as recorded by Clearchus, in iambics, the answer to which is a eunuch (*ἀνήρ τε κοὐκ ἀνήρ*), a bat (*ὄρνιθα κοὐκ ὄρνιθ'*), fennel (*ξύλου τε κοὐ ξύλου*), and pumice (*λίθωι τε κοὐ λίθωι*).[41]

---

[39] Cf. *δειλὸς ἄρ' ἐφαινόμην*, Arch. 23.12; *οὐκ ἄν τις...ἀνὴρ λέοντ' ἔδεισεν*, Sem. 14.1-2.

[40] Diogenes Laertius (9.16) informs us that he put forth in iambics the teachings of Heraclitus.

[41] Panarces' riddles may be part of an old iambic tradition, cf. Schear 1984: 40 who thinks that Sem. 7 is a poem with entertainment in mind: the comparisons of the women to animals, or to the sea and earth are expansions of the popular game of *eikasmos* (conjecturing, guessing), a popular pastime.

11. *Diphilus (date uncertain).*

Invective (?): Our information about him is problematic and comes from the schol. *ad Ar. Nu.* 96d: *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ Δίφιλος εἰς Βοίδαν τὸν φιλόσοφον ὁλόκληρον συνέταξεν ποίημα, δι' οὗ †ούκ† εἰς δουλείαν ἐρυπαίνετο ⟨ὁ⟩ φιλόσοφος· οὐ διὰ τοῦτο δὲ ἐχθρὸς ἦν.* The two extant fragments, which liken one's guiding of horses to that of the hero Semus, ostensibly come from *Theseis*, but, as West notes,[42] if this is the case the poem was likely to be ludicrous. Otherwise the Diphilus of the scholiast must be a different person from the Diphilus of the two fragments.[43] It is very likely, however, that the poem against Boidas was abusive, although its meter remains unknown.

B. *General Observations*

1. Food/Eating

It appears in a number of fragments in Ananius,[44] but most noteworthy is its occurrence in fr. 5, an extended culinary reference on a par with Hipponax at his most extravagant. In the elegies and early iambus the theme of food is limited and peripheral, but in Hipponax's (and Solon's) trimeters it becomes one of the prominent elements. Many of the relevant terms appearing in Ananius are also found in Hipponax, for instance, *ἰσχάς* 8.1, 124; *μυσσωτός*, 26.2; *λαγούς*, 26a.1; *κράμβη*, 104.47, and the way in which they are depicted seems to continue the tradition of Solon and Hipponax.[45]

2. Invective

It takes a variety of forms. It may be: a direct attack, as in Susarion's public denunciation (*κακὸν γυναῖκες*) and Euclides' likening of Epichares to hellebore (frr. 1, 2); sarcastic commentary, as in Timocr. 7, where the poet unfavorably compares the Milesians of old to the pre-

[42] West 1998: 61 (vol. ii).
[43] So Gerber 1999: 225.
[44] The reference to figs in Herm. 2 is probably sexual.
[45] Crates (fourth century) writes iambics that as a rule are humorous and treat the theme of food frequently (as do his hexameters and his only surviving elegy). Cercidas, an iambic poet of the third century, writes satires and, although a prosperous citizen (and also a member of the philosophical circle of the Cynics), adopts the persona of a hungry man.

sent ones; or a reference to the target's perceived sexual deviation (Anacr. 7). Herm. 4 is also abusive, as Athenaeus makes clear (*οὓς χλευάζων Ἕρμιππος*), and so must Herm. 6 be, if Hartung's restoration has any validity and the poem is scatological (cf. Hip. 24, 61, 92, 114c). The widespread element of invective in these later poets creates a strong connection with their iambic predecessors, in whose poetries abuse was also an important aspect.

3. Contemplation on women

Susarion's declaration that women are evil brings to mind Sem. 7.115, in which the poet concludes that women are the greatest evil created by Zeus (*Ζεὺς γὰρ μέγιστον τοῦτ'* [i.e., women] *ἐποίησεν κακόν*, 115).

4. Domestic/Private Life

The depiction of everyday scenes in Anacr. 1 and 6 suggests a possible connection with the earlier iambic tradition of domestic settings. Anacr. 1 comes from the direct speech of a character in such a setting, in a manner similar to that of Sem. 22 and 23, in which the speaker, who has brought cheese from Achaea, addresses Telembrotus, perhaps his host. The reference to fire and shelter in Anacr. 1 relates to a number of fragments from Hipponax in which the characters are in need of clothes and a warm place; and, if we are to infer from the remarks of Plutarch (*οὗτος οὐκ εἶχε χρείαν ὑποδοχῆς; οὐδὲ χλαίνης…κτλ.*), who quotes the lines, we may assume that Anacreon, too, mentions clothes. In archaic elegy there are no real parallels to this kind of poetry. In lyric, treatment of domestic life is not a major thematic element, although not totally absent (cf., the speaker in Anacr. 385 *PMG*, who is a female coming from the river, where she has washed clothes). The genre in which one can most easily find narratives featuring everyday private activities is iambus, and at this we should look as the most likely tradition reflected by Anacreon in frr. 1 and 6.

5. Prayer

The probably subversive invocation of the god for help in Anan. 1 (*Ἄπολλον…ἵκεο*) finds precedents in Hipponax, for instance, fr. 3a (*Ἑρμῆ…δεῦρο*). A prayer to Apollo of abusive content is also found in Archilochus (*ὦναξ Ἄπολλον…πήμαινε*, 26). The fact that all the other fragments of Ananius mention food makes it likely that his corpus is

of the Hipponactean type and thus his prayer may also be in the mold of the non-serious or abusive iambus.

6. Death

The tone and character of Anacr. 2 are quite different from those in the rest of the iambic corpus of the poet, as well as the themes of narrowed iambus generally. On the other hand, death is one of the important motifs in elegy and serious iambus. We must keep in mind, however, that Anacreon's date is fairly early and the use of serious topics in iambics would not yet have been unusual. The poet's career is primarily associated with the courts of Polycrates in Samos and Hipparchus and Hippias in Athens, where erotic and non-political poetry was favored, but it is quite possible that some of the extant fragments (fr. 2 included) predate his tenure at Samos, that is, they were written during his Thracian period (perhaps in the 540's).[46]

7. Old Age

The context of Anacr. 3 remains unclear. Aging, however, expressed through the loss or whitening of hair, is one of the important motifs in the poetry of Anacreon, always associated with a decline of fortunes in the field of love: the girl from Lesbos, for instance, does not pay attention to the speaker because she shuns his *κόμην λευκήν* (358 *PMG*). The theme of old age is found in elegy (Mimnermus, Solon, Theognis) and outside it, also in serious iambus (cf. Semonides), but it is treated mostly either with an existential attitude, as a step before death, or as a practical consideration (poor health, lack of respect, and so on). Anacreon on the other hand is willing to make jokes about the subject, and even treat it in a context with implicit sexual nuances, as in the verb *ἀναβαίνω* with its potential *double entendre* in fr. 395 *PMG*.[47] Whether this is the case here as well, we cannot tell.

---

[46] Cf. Kirkwood 1974: 272n.7: "A few fragments seem to be linked to war and patriotism …but none of these has any perceptible link with Samos." See also Kantzios 2005: 227-45.

[47] Cf. Giangrande 1967: 109-11.

8. Erotic/Sexual References

Sexual language appears in Anacr. 5, in which the female speaker describes herself as "corrupt" (*κνυζή*), "experienced" (*πέπειρα*) and overwhelmed with lust (*μαργοσύνην*); and in Anacr. 7, in which the abuse concentrates on the passive homosexuality of the target. Anacr. 4 (*αἱ δέ μεο φρένες ἐκκεκωφέαται*) may be erotic, not necessarily explicitly sexual, but the fragment is too short for further speculation. Erotic desire expressed as bodily dysfunction and absence of clear mind is found in the epodes of Archilochus, cf. (*ἔρως*) *κλέψας ἐκ στηθέων...φρένας*, 191; (*ἔρως*) *πολλὴν κατ᾽ ἀχλὺν ὀμμάτων ἔχευεν*, 191; *λυσιμελὴς πόθος*, 196.[48] Hermippus also refers to a woman with a term suggesting a prostitute in fr. 5, and again the speaker's enemy may be abused on account of his sexual predilections in fr. 2.

CHART OF SUBJECT MATTER IN LATER IAMBUS [49]

The numbers below indicate the fragment numbers in West 1998.

	Non-serious/ Abusive	Elegiac/ Serious Iambic	Uncertain
Ananius	1, 2, 3, 4, 5		
Demodocus			6
Anacreon	1, 5, 6, 7	2	3, 4
Susarion	1		
Euclides	1, 2		
Hermippus	2, 3, 4, 5, 6		
Timocreon	10		7 (invective?)
Euenus		1	
Scythinus		1	
TOTAL	18	3	4

The chart above suggests that iambic poetry from Hipponax (ca. 530's) to late fifth century treats themes most of which lie within the

[48] In elegy the erotic feeling is expressed in terms similar to these, but not any more explicitly.

[49] Not appearing in the chart: Panarces (one of his riddles is reported in tetrameters by Clearchus); and Diphilus (status uncertain; the testimonium in fr. 1 [Gerber 1999] mentions abusive poetry against Boidas, but the meter is unknown).

boundaries defined by narrow iambus. Approximately 85% of the later iambic fragments (not counting those that are thematically uncertain) probably contain one or more of the following: food, invective, sexual references, domestic/private life, non-serious prayer. All of the above characteristics are also found in the poetry of Hipponax. There are a few fragments pointing to serious iambus, but they may be explained as remnants of the old tradition that, for whatever reason, managed to survive. Even if the death of serious iambus is not absolute, the later fragments suggest that from the last third of the sixth century the genre is substantially devoid of "elegiac" elements. The question is, why? We would like to suggest that a likely cause or contributing factor is the invention of tragedy.

III. The Rise of Tragedy and the Disappearance of Serious Iambus

Aristotle, our most authoritative source on classical drama, makes a schematic division of the pre-dramatic poetry into epic and iambus, considering their practitioners as the ones responsible for the creation of tragedy and comedy, respectively: *παραφανείσης δὲ τῆς τραγῳδίας καὶ κωμῳδίας οἱ ἐφ' ἑκάτερον τὴν ποίησιν ὁρμῶντες κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν οἱ μὲν ἀντὶ τῶν ἰάμβων κωμῳδοποιοὶ ἐγένοντο, οἱ δὲ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπῶν τραγῳδοδιδάσκαλοι* (*Poet.* 1448b24-1449a5). The precise historical relationship between these pairs of literary genres is probably beyond our grasp now; moreover, specification of such a relationship requires criteria that are both rigid and quantifiable. But what degree of structural, thematic or linguistic overlapping is necessary in order to accept the validity of a generic affiliation between two genres?[50] It is clear, for instance, that iambus presents a wide range of similarities with comedy, such as meter (trimeters and tetrameters), invective, sexual situations, low-class characters, emphasis on particular themes (food, everyday life), mockery of certain types (homosexuals, gluttons), adoption of the point of view of an ordinary man, parody of previous poetry.[51] Comedy, then, might be

[50] Willi 2002: 7.

[51] Cf. West 1974: 37. See especially Rosen 1988b, who devotes his effort to showing that iambus and (old) comedy employ similar modes of diction, poetic devices and motifs and that the comic poets were conscious of the iambographic background of their craft and thus shaped their invective according to its conventions. Also, Degani

considered the direct descendant of archaic iambus. Yet the literary connection between the two genres is more complicated than it appears to be at first sight, for they derive from different historical and geographical backgrounds: iambus develops in Ionia in the seventh and sixth centuries, while comedy is invented in Athens in the fifth. The former's audience is restricted (symposium, *hetaireia*), the latter's is the masses at the theater; the one grows in an aristocratic milieu, the latter under the Athenian democracy.[52] Bowie,[53] in fact, is quite sceptical about the relationship between iambus and comedy, considering the similarities limited and coming rather from a crossing of the abusive and narrative practices of the Greeks that were present in a variety of social and political contexts associated with the two genres. A connection, then, that at first sight appears self-evident is in fact more nuanced and diffuse.

The provenance of tragedy is even more obscure and problematic. Scholars have proposed a variety of theories regarding the content as well as the context and mode of performance of very early tragedy. Aristotle in his *Poetics* tells us that it arose from the dithyramb (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξαρχόντων τὸν διθύραμβον*) and satyric choruses (*ἐκ τοῦ σατυρικοῦ*), and this reference, in association with a number of other indications, has brought to the fore the idea that tragedy from its early stages was directly associated with the cult of Dionysus.[54] Thespis' great development around 535 B.C.E., was to appear as an actor/speaker conversing with the chorus between their songs, an innovation springing from the exchanges between a chorus and its leader in previous ritual contexts, such as dirges, paeans, dithyrambs, and so forth.[55]

A voice attempting to dissociate tragedy from ritual practices is that of G. W. Else,[56] who questions the accuracy of Aristotle's infor-

---

1993: 1-49. For the element of parody and the expectation that the audience would recognize the literary allusions in both iambic satire and comedy, see Loraux 1993: 109.

[52] Zanetto 2001: 66.

[53] Bowie 2002: 40 ff. He concedes, however, that both the names Archilochus and Hipponax and at least part of their work were presumably known to the comic poets and their audiences and were associated with expressions of aggression and abuse.

[54] Cf. Connor 1989: 7-23, who suggests that Thespis and the other early tragic poets were performed in the Rural Dionysia, since only later were the performances held in the city.

[55] West 1974: 33.

[56] Else 1965.

mation, suggesting that he, too, was probably ill-informed about the very early stages of tragedy, since records were kept only after the year 502/1, and therefore his statement about the origin of tragedy in dithyrambic practices may be pure conjecture. Else points out that Aristotle does not speak specifically about Dionysiac dithyramb, and that by the fourth century dithyramb was simply a narrative on heroic subjects, the type of song he may have had in mind. Else proposes a different approach by attempting to show that Solon, as a kind of forerunner, is indirectly responsible for the origin and development of tragedy: he himself is almost a proto-tragic hero, and his poetry (both elegiac and iambic) contains the seeds of dilemmas and issues that later become the heart of tragedy.[57] Thespis, according to Else, took the epic hero from Homer, impersonation and iambic verse from Solon, and created tragedy.

> Why did Solon choose iambic and trochaic verses for his final accounting? Must he not have felt that elegiacs were inadequate for such intimate grapplings with reality? He kept them for certain kinds of utterance, for example his warnings against tyranny, but they were too distant and impersonal to express the truth about himself as he had come to see it. For that he needed the directness, the flash and cutting edge of Archilochus' instrument with crackling vigor, yet with a seriousness of purpose, a public sense of involvement and responsibility, which is un-Archilochian.[58]

More recently, J. Herington[59] has argued along similar lines, in that he also dissociates tragedy from cult. His approach, however, is more inclusive than that of Else, since he understands tragedy as the synthesis of the different branches of the literary tradition: elegy, iambus, choral lyric and epic. Herington[60] too suggests that Solon is an important figure in the shaping of early tragedy, not least for his role in transplanting to Attica the poetry and meters developed during the seventh century by the Ionians on the eastern side of the Aegean. The other important figure is Homer, who shows how to construct a plot

[57] Cf. also Fränkel 1975: 225; Anhalt 1993: 30n.42; Blaise 1995: 26.

[58] Else 1965: 45.

[59] Herington 1985: 113 ff.

[60] Herington 1985: 119: "In the Ionian iambists…the first tragedians found ready to hand not merely a verse form but also a style of composition and performance that were superbly fitted to the argumentation, the clash of personalities, inherent in *drama* as we now understand it."

around an event of manageable scale and how to create characterization by means of speech.[61]

Although these theories of the secular origin of tragedy are attractive insofar as they provide a clear and comprehensive model, they also present a number of difficulties. In the first place, Else's exclusive focus on Solon as the sole expression of serious iambus should give us pause, since a considerable part of the iambic poetry of the earlier generation is not abusive or sexual but of a moral and philosophical nature. Archilochus and Semonides demonstrate that Solon's iambus did not appear in a vacuum: although his poetry is the expression of a prominent public figure, and as such unique, his use of trimeters for serious contemplation finds precedent in the generation before him. Herington is more impartial in his evaluation of the role of the Athenian poet, but his hypothesis, too, creates some difficulties. It has rightly been pointed out that we must not dismiss Aristotle lightly: even if we accept that he did not have firm knowledge about the beginnings of tragedy, still he had access to a much more extensive corpus of early literature than we do and could make much more informed guesses.[62] The hypothesis that tragedy arose from the performance of a chorus is encouraged by the fact that the further back we go in time, the more prominent the function of the chorus becomes. Another difficulty for the theory of the secular origin of tragedy is the presence of the satyr-play as part of the tetralogy: the close relationship between satyr choruses and Dionysus is well recognized.[63] The notion that early choral poetry is merely the source of meters and melodies and that there is no significant religious meaning in the City Dionysia (the Dionysiac tales are explained by Herington as grotesque subject matter, of which early tragedy is fond) raise questions: if Homer is the direct source of tragedy, why did the latter not adopt four or five characters right away rather than evolving gradually from one?[64]

---

[61] *Ibid*, 134, 137.

[62] Lucas 1967: 70-2.

[63] The whole question of satyr choruses is in fact one of the thorns in Aristotle's theory, since the only way to reconcile the dithyrambic and satyric origin of tragedy is to suppose the existence of satyric dithyramb, clear proof of which we do not possess; but see Seaford 1977: 81-94.

[64] See Burnett 1987: 154-56; also Adrados' 1975: 7 reaction to the notion of tragedy as a synthesis of various non-Dionysiac elements.

We would not want to suggest here that the origin of tragedy lies (wholly or partially) in literary iambus, which is a secular genre. On the other hand, the fact that tragedy has ritual associations should not make contact with iambus an unlikely proposition. The virtual disappearance of serious iambus around the time of the invention of tragedy remains obscure, but it may well be attributed to the fact that after the tragedians, whatever their reasons, chose iambic trimeters and tetrameters for the spoken parts of their dramas, the iambic poets felt that the space traditionally occupied by serious iambus was now taken by the new genre; and either they adopted that innovation or, if they continued to write non-dramatic iambic poetry, they concentrated on the abusive aspect.[65]

The fact that serious iambus disappears while tragedy rises does not, of course, establish in itself that the latter is the direct descendant of the former. To reach any conclusion regarding the historical relationship of the two genres we have to consider a number of other factors, such as dialect, verse structure, meter, content and context of performance. Let us turn our attention briefly to each:

Dialect: iambus is the product of the Eastern Greeks (Archilochus from Paros; Semonides from Amorgos; Hipponax from Ephesus). Only Solon the Athenian is the exception, but the fact that he also writes in Ionian instead of his native Attic bears testimony to the fact that he follows the conventions of those who are responsible for the shaping of literary iambus. In contrast, Ionian is absent from tragedy: its spoken parts are in Attic, while its lyric parts retain a Dorian dialect.

Verse structure: as Herington meticulously explains, to a large extent the iambic trimeters and tetrameters are indistinguishable from those of tragedy: "The Ionian and tragic trimeter share certain basic

---

[65] While serious iambus virtually disappears with the invention of tragedy, abusive iambus, as we have seen in the previous section, does not die altogether with the appearance of comedy, although certainly its importance is substantially reduced. Assessments that iambus is dead after Hipponax, cf. Cunningham 1971: 12 and Kerkhecker 1999: 5, seem to contain an element of exaggeration. Aristotle, among other sources, makes a reference to performance of later iambus: *τοὺς δὲ νεωτέρους οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε κωμῳδίας θεατὰς νομοθετητέον*, *Pol.* 1336b20; cf. Bartol 1992: 65-71. It is reasonable to postulate, however, that in the fifth century most of the iambic energy is absorbed by comedy. It is not accidental that Hermippus, of whom some iambic lines survive, was primarily a comic poet (first victory at the City Dionysia, 435 B.C.E.).

laws—notably the insistence on a caesura within the second metron, the restriction of resolution to certain places in the line and the observance of Porson's law...and the same applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to the tetrameters."[66] Soon, however, the tragedians introduce certain changes that facilitate even more the capture of the rhythm of everyday speech (occasional use of the so-called caesura media instead of regular caesuras and dramatic increase in the frequency of resolution).[67]

Meter: Aristotle tells us that initially the meter of tragedy was the tetrameter but later it became the trimeter.[68] Aeschylus' *Persians*, the earliest extant tragedy, contains three passages in tetrameters, a total of 114 lines; the same meter appears again in *Agamemnon*, very briefly in *Oedipus Tyrannus* and then it disappears until it is later revived by Euripides.[69] The question is why tragedy should start with tetrameters instead of the more natural rhythm of trimeters.[70] Aristotle connects the use of the tetrameter with the satyric character of early tragedy, with its emphasis on dancing (cf. *διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὀρχηστικωτέραν εἶναι τὴν ποίησιν*).[71] West believes that this is due to

[66] Herington 1985: 117.

[67] Herington 1985: 260n.62, with references to Korzeniewski and Maas. For the similarities between Archilochus and the *Persians* regarding the use of resolutions, see also Broadhead 1960: 298; Raalte 1986: 122. For an extensive comparison of several metrical aspects (frequency and location of resolution, word-end at various positions of verse, percentages of verses with penthemimeral and hephthemimeral caesura, caesura media, elisions, etc.) which generally indicate the metrical affinities of the Ionian and dramatic trimeters, see Raalte 1986: 104 ff.

[68] *Poet*. 1449a.19: *τό τε μέτρον ἐκ τετραμέτρου ἰαμβεῖον ἐγένετο*; *Poet*. 1449a21: *τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον τετραμέτρῳ ἐχρῶντο διὰ τὸ σατυρικὴν καὶ ὀρχηστικωτέραν εἶναι τὴν ποίησιν, λέξεως δὲ γενομένης αὐτὴ ἡ φύσις τὸ οἰκεῖον μέτρον εὗρε· μάλιστα γὰρ λεκτικὸν τῶν μέτρων τὸ ἰαμβεῖόν ἐστιν*; *Rhet*. 1404a30: *ἐκ τετραμέτρου εἰς ἰαμβεῖον μετέβησαν.*

[69] *Agamemnon*: 24 lines; *Oedipus Tyrannus*: 16 lines (1515-30, but the authenticity of the ending of the speech is disputed). Euripides has altogether 337 lines. Drew-Bear 1968: 386-7 provides a list of tragic passages (dramatic fragments included) in trochaic tetrameter. See also Herington 1985: 260.

[70] Regarding the metrics of the very early tragedy, we have little testimony besides Aristotle. Suda informs us that Phrynichus *εὑρετὴς τοῦ τετραμέτρου ἐγένετο*, which, although not true, indicates that his name was associated with this meter, suggesting in turn that he must have used it to some extent.

[71] The element of excitement is often associated with the use of dramatic tetrameters (cf. the connotations of running, *τροχάδην*, in the term "trochaic"). Drew-Bear 1968: 388 (on the first entrance of Atossa in the *Persians*): "The impact of the spectacle would have been heightened by the excited trochaic metre, which explains why Aeschylus uses it here." Later, however, he acknowledges that a similar scene in

the fact that the early tragedians follow the tradition in distinguishing between trimeters and tetrameters: "Archilochus clearly had a bias towards tetrameters for serious subjects; we do not know that Solon used the metre for any but serious themes (though our knowledge is one-sided); and Anacreon chose it for his lament for Aristoclides. There was no more natural metre for Thespis to adopt, given that he did not want to sing."[72] This statement reveals West's inclination to downplay both the serious side of trimeters and the abusive aspect of tetrameters. Although the tetrameters of Archilochus are indeed more prone to serious repertory than his trimeters, they nevertheless also contain some of the familiar "narrowed" themes, such as sexual references and invective.[73] We even find the same targets of abuse, namely, the Lycambes family (Neoboule, fr. 118 and Dotades?, fr. 151.3) or characters who are treated seriously elsewhere but in a lighthearted or even abusive spirit here (Glaucus, fr. 117; Pericles, fr. 124). The case of Solon, with only two fragments extant, cannot weigh much as an argument for the one-sidedness of his tetrameters. Against Anacreon's serious trochaic fragment we may place the tetrameters of Ananius (fr. 5), Euclides (frr. 1, 2) and Hermippus (frr. 5, 6), none of which are serious. One should also keep in mind that, although trochaic lines occur in the *Persians*, our earliest tragedy, with the highest frequency, they still represent a much smaller proportion than the trimeters (one hundred and fourteen tetrameters versus four hundred and twenty-nine trimeters).[74] Under such circumstances, it is difficult to postulate that the early tragic poets understood the tetrameters as more suitable for their craft on account of their greater seriousness or for any other reason.[75]

Agamemnon (810 ff.) is entirely in trimeters. We must also note here that the Messenger's speech, so excitedly anticipated, is in trimeters. Fraenkel 1950: *ad* 1649: "The rhythm changes to greater excitement." Broadhead 1960: 298: the change to trochaic measures indicates "greater animation or excitement." Michelini 1982: 41 ff. seems to be on the right track when she suggests that the trimeters and tetrameters have separate and complementary functions, the latter used in short speeches and stichomythy, leading to or framing long trimeter speeches, thus creating a layered effect.

[72] West 1974: 34.

[73] Sexual frr: 119, 152; abusive: 113, 125, 126.

[74] Michelini 1982: 46n.12.

[75] Dramatic trimeters, so skillfully used by Aeschylus, could have not been initiated by him without some sort of a tradition. Cf. Herington 1985: 257n.31, who points out that iambic trimeters already occur in the fragments of Choerilus and Phrynichus.

Content: The extant tragedies and the titles we know of suggest that most of them have as their subject heroic myths taken from Homer and the epic cycle. Are there any affinities, then, with the contents of iambus? The answer eludes us because, despite some indications, concrete evidence of the treatment of mythological themes in iambus is lacking. Most of the references to figures of myth in the trimeters are expressed in passing or in burlesque narratives, although we must allow for the possibility of more extensive and serious treatment of the subject, at least in Archilochus (cf. fr. 288), that has not survived. We should also keep in mind that in the early stages almost all of the themes of elegiac poetry are found in iambus as well. Since elegy does treat of myth, and on occasion at some length (cf. Mimn. 4, 11, 11a, 12), it is a reasonable assumption that iambus utilizes it, too. But even if this is the case, it is impossible to prove that mythological subjects came into tragedy through the channel of iambus, since they are contained in various other genres, particularly choral poetry.

Aphorisms and gnomic wisdom similar to those of serious iambus are also present in tragedy, and one could argue for several iambic borrowings, both verbal and notional. For example:[76]

Sem. 1.2: *(Ζεὺς) τίθησ᾽ ὅκῃ θέλει*	Eur. *Or.* 1545-6: *τέλος ἔχει δαίμων βροτοῖς, τέλος ὅπᾳ θέλῃ.*
Sem. 1.3: *νοῦς δ᾽ οὐκ ἐπ᾽ ἀνθρώποισιν*	Eur. fr. 25.4: *νοῦς δ᾽ οὐκ ἔνεστιν, οἰόσμεθα δ᾽ εὖ φρονεῖν.*
Sem. 1.20: *οὕτω κακῶν ἄπ᾽ οὐδέν*	Soph. *OT* 1284-5: *στεναγμός, ἄτη, θάνατος, αἰσχύνη, κακῶν...οὐδέν ἐστ᾽ ἀπόν.*
	Eur. *Hel.* 217: *τί γὰρ ἄπεστί σοι κακῶν;*

Yet similar pronouncements appear in a variety of genres; hence it is impossible to establish a direct relationship between iambus and tragedy on this basis.[77] Sem. 6, for example, unquestionably presents strong similarities with fragments from both Sophocles and Euripides:

Elsewhere (1974: 33) West, too, seems to entertain the possibility that Aristotle may have erroneously taken the trimeters as a subsequent development.

[76] The parallels are taken mostly from Gerber 1970, *ad loc.* and 1984: 125-35; also Campbell 1967, *ad loc.*

[77] West 1979: 1-6 and Janko 1980: 291-3 have suggested that the fable of the eagle and the fox is utilized in the *Oresteia*. The former has argued that the source of the bird-avenging god in the parodos of *Agamemnon* is the famous epode of Archilochus

Sem. 6: *γυναικὸς οὐδὲν χρῆμ᾽ ἀνὴρ ληΐζεται / ἐσθλῆς ἄμεινον οὐδὲ ῥίγιον κακῆς.*	Soph. Fr. 682 *οὕτω γυναικὸς οὐδὲν ἂν μεῖζον κακὸν κακῆς ἀνὴρ κτήσαιτ᾽ ἂν οὐδὲ σώφρονος κρεῖσσον.*
	Eur. Fr. 494 N2 *τῆς μὲν κακῆς κάκιον οὐδὲν γίγνεται γυναικός, ἐσθλῆς δ᾽ οὐδὲν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν πέφυκ᾽ ἄμεινον.*

Still, there is no guarantee that it is Semonides who influenced the tragedians, and not Hesiod:

> *οὐ μὲν γάρ τι γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ ληΐζετ᾽ ἄμεινον*
> *τῆς ἀγαθῆς, τῆς δ᾽ αὖτε κακῆς οὐ ῥίγιον ἄλλο* (*Op.* 702-3).[78]

The influence of iambus is more likely when the tragedians seem to use formulas, as with *ἡλίου φάος*, which is found at the end of the line in Sem. 1.19 and also in Eur. *Bacch.* 380 and Aesch. *Ag.* 508.

Context of performance: Literary iambus is a sympotic genre and as such is performed in the private domain among friends or among the members of the *hetaireia*. The iambic poems are monodic and most are relatively short in length. Given that the longer elegiac poems treating topics from the epic cycle and foundation myths are performed at festivals, if in fact iambus does contain such topics as well it is very likely that it, too, is performed at festivals. Such a shared context of performance would strengthen the relationship between iambus and tragedy, but the facts are far from clear in this regard.

In short, while the dialect of the spoken parts of tragedy does not point towards the Ionian iambus, the structure of the verse has very strong

---

(fr. 177); the latter thinks that echoes of the fable can be seen in the depiction of the eagle's nestlings (Orestes and Electra) in their teaming for revenge (246-51, 255-9).

[78] Similarly, the idea of Arch. 134 (*οὐ γὰρ ἐσθλὰ κατθανοῦσι κερτομεῖν ἐπ᾽ ἀνδράσιν*) is found in Eur. *El.* 900 and 902 (*αἰσχύνομαι...νεκροὺς ὑβρίζειν, μή μέ τις φθόνῳ βάλῃ*), but also in *Od.* 22.412 (*οὐχ ὁσίη κταμένοισιν ἐπ᾽ ἀνδράσιν εὐχετάασθαι*). The thought of Arch. 25.2 appears also in *Od.* 14.228, cf. Fowler 1987: 23-4: "There is nothing remarkable about this sentiment; in the *Odyssey* it is used in the gnomic manner as an explanation. Clement provides a parallel from Euripides (fr. 560 N2*). καρδίην ἰαίνεται* is a phrase borrowed from general epic stock (cf. *Od.* 4.548 ff.)." Sem. 1.2 can be seen in *Od.* 4.23, *Op.* 663-9; Sem. 1.4 in Thgn. 135-6, 141-2.

similarities with it. This suggests that the tragic poets consciously used what their Ionian counterparts had achieved. That is as far as we can go, however, in confidently hypothesizing the direct relationship between tragedy and iambus. In terms of subject matter there are similarities between the two genres, but it is difficult to verify the connection.[79] Also, since the festival is not a certain context of performance for iambus, we cannot speculate on a further connection with tragedy in this respect.

Even what constitutes very early tragedy (Thespis, Choerilus, Pratinas, Phrynichus) remains uncertain. It appears, however, that early tragedy consists of long narrative speeches interrupted by choral songs. Three of the lost plays of Aeschylus about Achilles almost certainly constitute a trilogy, and if we can judge from its titles, the trilogy covers extremely extensive ground, from the sending of Patroclus into battle to the ransoming of Hector's body, which in the *Iliad* is treated in books 16-24.[80] Such a massive amount of material (even if used in the most selective way) certainly requires long narratives, which are probably very similar to those in rhapsodic performances. But while the rhapsode is alone in front of the audience reciting lengthy passages from Homer, tragedy is the result of interaction between narrative speeches and choral song. In a sense, early tragedy is the synthesis or confrontation of two different modes of performance, monodic and choral, both with long traditions and both closely associated with religious practices.

It is perhaps these established and well demarcated territories that prompt the early tragedians to make their work distinct, not only in terms of sound but also of spectacle: the chorus no longer performs circular dances as in the dithyrambic tradition but makes square formations (although the orchestra is circular); and the meter of the speaker/actor is not dactylic like that of the rhapsode but iambic. Again, there may have been some intention to emphasize the distinct-

[79] The same applies for the use of the person of the verb: the early trimeters (certainly Archilochus) make the first and second persons of the verb, especially in the singular, important agents of action. This usage is reduced significantly by the time of Hipponax. Tragedy, on the other hand, being a dramatic form in which the characters interact with each other, also makes extensive use of the first and second persons. This common trait may be another potential link between the two genres, although, again, a secure connection cannot be established since in the Homeric epics, too, the plot develops from direct interaction among the various characters.

[80] Herington 1985: 139.

iveness of the new genre; but the change from dactylic meters into iambics may also have been intended to free the verse from its dependence on formulas and give it more flexibility and realism. Later, as Aristotle tells us (1449a19), the trimeter becomes the main meter of tragedy, perhaps because it is nearer to the rhythms of everyday speech.

The precise relationship between archaic iambus and early tragedy, apart from the latter's inheritance of iambic meter, remains poorly understood. Theories, however, that try to present tragedy as the direct descendant of literary iambus face major difficulties, because they must account for the presence of unmistakable Dionysiac elements in the context of tragic performance. Still, it seems certain that, whatever the reason, after the middle of the sixth century iambus loses the dual nature which characterizes it from the seventh century on. To explain such a drastic change we should look for some literary development great enough to upset the well-established co-existence of the serious and non-serious elements. There is no event of sufficient magnitude at this period other than the invention of tragedy. The iambic poets were versed in the scurrilous but also in contemplative, gnomic and philosophical discourses. Some of these poets must have recognized the possibilities of the new genre and promptly shifted poetic allegiance. Those who remained faithful to the old iambic craft saw that the space available to them now was that which remained unused by tragedy: the non-serious, invective and coarse, that is, the type of poetry we may call "narrowed" iambus.

CONCLUSION

We saw in Chapter Two that Archilochus, Semonides, Hipponax and to a certain degree Solon share a considerable number of thematic elements, elements that represent an important part of the repertory of the trimeters from the middle of the seventh to the latter part of the sixth centuries. We also observed that Hipponax is different from his predecessors primarily because he is devoid of serious subject matter. In Archilochus and Semonides, alongside sexual references and abusive remarks we find serious reflection on life, fate and the relationship between gods and mortals, and in Solon, alongside his political commentary we find long references to food and wine-drinking, but in Hipponax there is no such duality: almost everything now revolves exclusively around food, sex and abuse. While serious contemplation, whether political or philosophical, is an important aspect of the trimeters of the first two generations, by the time of Hipponax it disappears.

In Chapter Three we presented a number of variables that best reflect the evolving identity of archaic trimeters. We noted that the character of the first person begins with wide diversity in the first generation and becomes very narrow and consistent in Solon and Hipponax. There is also a shift away from the "I" and/or "we" towards "he/she:" while Archilochus and perhaps Semonides have high percentages of the first person, in Hipponax its significance is reduced. On the other hand, while the rate of the third person is relatively low in the first generation, in Hipponax it increases dramatically. Last, we saw that the early trimeters are more abstract: through the use of verbs of cognition, perception and emotion as well as a restrained use of "tangible" nouns, Archilochus and Semonides often convey the interior aspects of their characters unlike Hipponax, who tends to present a photographic depiction of reality, seen from without.

In Chapter Four we compared the themes and character presentation of the elegiac poetry with those of the trimeters in order to show that while the early trimeters have many common characteristics with elegy, the later verses are noticeably different. The comparison suggests that the early iambic poets understand the trimeters as a genre which is more inclusive than the elegies: while almost all the themes that appear in elegy are also found in the trimeters, there are certain motifs that are excluded from the elegies, namely, sexual and abusive ones. By the later part of the sixth century, however, the trimeters and elegy share very little, because the former now become very narrow and exclude serious subject matter. In addition, an examination of the identity of characters suggests that the "I" (and "you") in elegy on the one hand and the trimeters of Archilochus and Semonides on the other is quite diverse and often impersonal, while that of Hipponax (and Solon) is consistent and specific. Elegy and the early trimeters, moreover, show parallels in their tendency to use cognitive and emotive verbs and also nouns of "intangibles" at higher rates than the later poetry of Hipponax.

In Chapter Five we asked whether the reduction of "elegiac" elements in the poetry of Hipponax is an isolated incident without further implications or a more profound shift in the trimeters. Since Hipponax is the sole iambic representative of his generation and we are unable to compare him with contemporary poets, we sought information outside the archaic literary iambus, that is, in the archaic metrical epitaphs and dedications, as well as in the later iambic poetry. The epigraphic evidence supports the hypothesis that in the middle of the sixth century iambus undergoes a transformation and that serious subject matter is now increasingly expressed in elegiacs. In a similar way, the exiguous fragments of the later poets suggest that after Hipponax the iambics are as a rule dissociated from serious themes. This suggests that the absence of "elegiac" elements in Hipponax, as well as his focus on abuse and similar themes, is the expression of a more general shift in iambus in the last third of the sixth century.

But what factors, we asked, might have influenced this marked change or narrowing in the character of iambus in its later manifestations? The rise of tragic drama, employing iambic meter for serious content may have been responsible for draining the more ruminative energies of iambic poetry. These poets who chose to avoid

the dramatic genre were in effect forced to limit their iambic verse to non-serious subject matter.

Thus it seems clear that even within the scant period—little more than a hundred years—of its *floruit* iambic poetry underwent profound changes. These were less radical perhaps than the earlier evolution from cultic choral poetry to monodic sympotic verse; yet even so, the shift of thematography, use of person and vocabulary reveal that iambic verse is anything but the timeless monolith that it is sometimes seen to be. It is rather a complex, definable genre with all the dynamism that implies.

APPENDIX I

TRIMETERS

The Use of the Person of the Verb[1]

Archilochus

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (twenty-three occurrences): (*μοι*) *μέλει*, 19.1; *ἀγαίομαι*, 19.2; *ἐρέω*, 19.3; *κλαίω*, 20.1; *ἀνταμειβόμην*, 23.7; (*ἐμοί*) *μελήσει*, 23.10; *δοκέω*, 23.11; *ἐφαινόμην*, 23.12; *εἰμ'*, 23.13; *ἐπίσταμαι*, 23.14; *ἀρπαλίζομαι*, 24.4; (*μοι*) *μέλει*, 24.8; *εὐροίμην*, 24.11; *κατεστάθην*, 24.18; *ἐξερύκομαι*, 27.12; *ἐβουλόμην*, 48.18; *ἐδεξάμην*, 54.4;]*αμαι*, 58.4;]*λήσομαι*, 67.2; *οἶδα*, 67.3; *δοκέω*, 67.4;]*ήσομαι*, 67.7;]*ουλομαι*, 73.4. *PLURAL*: *God/Mythological*? (one occurrence): *διάξομεν*, 34.1.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (twenty-one occurrences): *τετραμήνηις*, 23.9; *τίθεο*, 23.10; *ἐπιστρέφεαι*, 23.17; *εἷλες*, 23.19; *ἐξήρω*, 23.19; *ἄνασσε*, 23.20; *ἔχε*, 23.20; *ἔσεαι*, 23.21; *ἦλθες*, 24.2; *π*[..]*εστάθης*, 24.7; *ἀπώλεσας*, 24.14; *εἶς*, 29.4; *δύνεαι*, 29.7; *εἶς*, 29.8; *ἐπίφρασαι*, 67.6;]*νώξυνες*, 82.4;]*οσεστάθης*, 82.6; *ἤρκεσας*, 82.7; *ἐλάγχανες*, 82.9; *ἐκάλλυνας*, 82.12; *φρονεῖς*, 82.13. *God/Mythological* (three occurrences): *πήμαινε*, 26.6; *ὄλλυ'*, 26.6; *ὀλλύεις*, 26.6. *Uncertain* (two occurrences):]*ύξεαι*, 27.5;]*ίζεαι*, 27.10. *PLURAL*: no occurrences.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (nine occurrences): *ἰαίνεται*, 25.2; *εἶπε*, 25.5; *ἐτέρπετο*, 30.1; *ἀπτερύσσετο*, 41.2; *ἔμυζε*, 42.2; *ἦν*, 42.2; *ἠράσσατο*, 48.6; *πειρήσεται*, 54.6; *ᾔείδει*, 57.8. *God/Mythological* (three occurrences): *ἐρρύσατο*, 24.15; *ἔθηκεν*, 25.7; *διαψέγοι*, 25.8.

[1] Only conjugated verbs, not infinitives and participles, are counted. When the subject is *δῆμος*, *πόλις*, *λαός*, and such, the verb is classified under the heading "Human." Animal characters are placed under "Other." The classification takes into account the meaning, not strictly the form, of the verb: (*μοι*) *μέλει*, for instance, is understood as first person while (*τοῖς ἐναντίοις*) *ἤνδανεν*, as third plural.

Other (eleven occurrences): *εἶλε*, 19.2; *ἐστιν*, 19.4; *ἕστηκεν*, 21.2; *πάρα* (*πάρεστι*), 23.16; *ἀπώλετο*, 24.9; *κατέκλυσεν*, 24.12; *κατεσκίαζε*, 31.2; *ἐστιν*, 35.1; *ἀμφιδέδρομεν*, 37.1; *ἐπλήμυρεν*, 43.3; *ἦν*, 44.1. *Uncertain* (two occurrences):]*εται*, 27.3; *ἴδηι*, 28.14. PLURAL: *Human* (four occurrences): *ἐξεπόρθησαν*, 23.18; *ἐκλίνθησαν*, 36.1; *ἀπέφλυσαν*, 45.1; *ἀπεστύπαζον*, 47.2.

Total: 79.

Semonides

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (seven occurrences): *ἀνέδραμον*, 10.1; *ἀλειφόμην*, 16.1; *ἡλσάμην*, 17.1; *κατήγαγον*, 23.2; *ἀπεῦσα*, 24.1; *ἐμίστυλα*, 24.1; *ἐπίσταμαι*, 24.2. *PLURAL*: *Human* (six occurrences): *ἐρῶιμεν*, 1.23; *αἰκιζοίμεθα*, 1.24; *ἐνθυμοίμεθα*, 2.1; *φρονοῖμεν*, 2.2; *ζῶμεν*, 3.2; *γινώσκομεν*, 7.114.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (four occurrences): *γαυρία*, 10a.1; *θαύμαζε*, 10a.2; *ἔντυε*, 10a.3; *προυκπονέαι*, 22.1. *PLURAL*: no occurrences.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (seventy-three occurrences): *δοκεῖ*, 1.9; *ληΐζεται*, 6.1; *πιαίνεται*, 7.6; *λέληθεν*, 7.9; *εἶπε*, 7.10; *ἔχει*, 7.11; *θέλει*, 7.13; *λέληκεν*, 7.15; *ὁρᾶι*, 7.15; *παύσειε*, 7.16; *ἐξαράξειεν*, 7.17; *τύχηι*, 7.19; *ἔχει*, 7.20; *οἶδε*, 7.23; *ἐπίσταται*, 7.24; *ἕλκεται*, 7.26; *νοεῖ*, 7.27; *γελᾶι*, 7.28; *γέγηθεν*, 7.28; *ἐπαινέσει*, 7.29; *ἔστιν*, 7.30; *μαίνεται*, 7.33; *γίνεται*, 7.36; *ἔστηκ'*, 7.38; *μαίνεται*, 7.39; *ἔοικε*, 7.41; *ἔστερξεν*, 7.45; *ἐπονήσατο*, 7.45; *ἐσθίει*, 7.46; *ἐσθίει*, 7.47; *ἐδέξατο*, 7.49; *ἐστιν*, 7.53; *διδοῖ*, 7.54; *ἔρδει*, 7.55; *κατεσθίει*, 7.56; *περιτρέπει*, 7.58; *ψαύσειεν*, 7.59; *ἄρειεν*, 7.60; *βάλοι*, 7.60; *ἵζοιτ'*, 7.62; *ποιεῖται*, 7.62; *λοῦται*, 7.63; *ἀλείφεται*, 7.64; *φορεῖ*, 7.65; *γίνεται*, 7.68; *ἦι*, 7.69; *ἀγλαΐζεται*, 7.70; *εἶσιν*, 7.74; *κινεῖται*, 7.75; *ἀγκαλίζεται*, 7.77; *ἐπίσταται*, 7.78; (*οἱ*) *μέλει*, 7.79; *βουλεύεται*, 7.81; *ἔρξειεν*, 7.82; *εὐτυχεῖ*, 7.83; *γηράσκει*, 7.86; *γίνεται*, 7.88; *ἥδεται*, 7.90; *διέρχεται*, 7.99; *πέλεται*, 7.100; *ἀπώσεται*, 7.101; *δοκῆι*, 7.103; *κορύσσεται*, 7.105; *ἐστιν*, 7.106; *δοκεῖ*, 7.108; *τυγχάνει*, 7.109; *ἁμαρτάνει*, 7.111; *αἰνέσει*, 7.112; *μωμήσεται*, 7.113; *ἔδεισεν*, 14.2; *ἦν*, 16.2; *ἔδωκεν*, 25.1; *εἶλε*, 26.1. *God/Mythological* (thirteen occurrences): *ἔχει*, 1.1; *τίθησ'*, 1.2; *ἐκτελευτήσει*, 1.5; *πέμπει*, 1.14; *ἐποίησεν*, 7.1; *ἔθηκ'*, 7.7; *ποιήσηι*, 7.25; *ὤπασεν*, 7.72; *χαρίζεται*, 7.92; *ἐποίησεν*, 7.96; *ἐποίησεν*,

7.115; *ἀμφέθηκεν*, 7.116; *ἐδέξατο*, 7.117. *Other* (fifteen occurrences): *τρέφει*, 1.6; *φθάνει*, 1.11; *ἵκηται*, 1.12; *ἀπ'* (*ἄπεστι*), 1.20; *ἐστί*, 3.1; *ἔχει*, 7.42; *πρόσεστιν*, 7.52; *ἐγείνατο*, 7.57; *προσιζάνει*, 7.84; *θάλλει*, 7.85; *ἀπαέξεται*, 7.85; *γίνεται*, 7.98; *ἀπείλετο*, 9.2; *παρέπτατο*, 13.1; *ἐκίνει*, 28.1. PLURAL: *Human* (eleven occurrences): *ζόουσι*, 1.4; *μένουσι*, 1.8; *θνήσκουσιν*, 1.17; *δυνήσωνται*, 1.17; *ἅψαντο*, 1.18; *λείπουσιν*, 1.19; *πιθοίατο*, 1.22; *λέγουσι*, 7.91; *δοκέωσι*, 7.97; *δεκοίατο*, 7.107; *χαίρουσι*, 7.111. *God/Mythological* (two occurrences): *ἔδωκαν*, 7.22; *ἔχουσι*, 20.2. *Other* (eight occurrences): *(ὅσ') ἐστί*, 1.2; *φθείρουσι*, 1.13; *(πήματ') ἐστίν*, 1.22; *(πάντα) κεῖται*, 7.4; *(πάντα) κυλίνδεται*, 7.4; *(φῦλα) ἐστίν*, 7.95; *(φῦλα) μενεῖ*, 7.95; *(ξύλα) πεπλέαται*, 31a.1.

Total: 139

Solon

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (twelve occurrences): *ξυνήγαγον*, 36.1; *ἐπαυσάμην*, 36.2; *ἀνεῖλον*, 36.6; *ἀνήγαγον*, 36.9; *ἔθηκα*, 36.15; *ἔρεξα*, 36.17; *διῆλθον*, 36.17; *ὑπεσχόμην*, 36.17; *ἔγραψα*, 36.20; *ἤθελον*, 36.22; *ἐστράφην*, 36.27; *κατέστην*, 37.10. *PLURAL*: no occurrences.

SECOND PERSON: no occurrences.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (five occurrences): *κατέσχε*, 36.22; *ἐχηρώθη*, 36.25; *κατέσχε*, 37.7; *ἐπαύσατο*, 37.7; *ἐξεῖλεν*, 37.8. *God/Mythological* (one occurrence): *συμμαρτυροίη*, 36.3; *Other* (three occurrences): *ἄπεστιν*, 38.4; *φέρει*, 38.5; *χρή*, 37.1. *PLURAL*: *Human* (nine occurrences): (*τοῖς ἐναντίοις*) *ἥνδανεν*, 36.23; *φρασαίατο*, 36.24; *ἔχουσι*, 37.2; *εἶδον*, 37.3; *αἰνοῖεν*, 37.5; *ποιοίατο*, 37.5; *πίνουσι*, 38.1; *τρώγουσι*, 38.1; *σπεύδουσι*, 39.1. *Other* (one occurrence): *(πάντα) πάρα* (*πάρεστι*), 38.5.

Total: 31

Hipponax

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (sixteen occurrences): *κατηυλίσθην*, 16.2; (*μοι*) *δοκεῖ*, 30.1; *ἐπεύχομαι*, 32.2; *ῥιγῶ*, 32.2; *βαμβαλύζω*, 32.3; *ἐρέω*, 35.1; *δώσω*, 39.1; *ποιήσωμαι*, 39.3; *λίσσομαι*, 40.2; *δώσω*, 44.1;

φοιτῶ, 73.6; *δέδοικ'*, 73.7; *ἐβίνεον*, 84.16; *ἐξέδυσα*, 104.17; *ἐπάκτωσα*, 104.19; *ἤλειφον*, 104.22. *God* (one occurrence): *δίδωμι*, 36.3. PLURAL: *Human* (three occurrences): *ἐδάκνομεν*, 84.11; *ἐφιλέομεν*, 84.11; *εἴχομεν*, 84.20.

SECOND PERSON: SINGULAR: *Human* (five occurrences): *συνοίκησας*, 15.1; *γράψῃς*, 28.1; *θέλεις*, 44.1; *προσκυνήσεις*, 47.2; *καλύπτεαι*, 52.1. *God* (five occurrences): *δός*, 32.4; *ἔδωκας*, 34.1; *ἔκρυψας*, 34.4; *ἔδωκας*, 38.2; *ἀποπέμψῃς*, 39.2. PLURAL: no occurrences.

THIRD PERSON: SINGULAR: *Human* (fourty-eight occurrences): *κατέκτεινεν*, 1.1; *ἔβωσε*, 3.1; *γένηται*, 10.1; *ῥαπισθείη*, 10.2; *κατήραξε*, 13.2; *προύπινεν*, 14.3; *ἔψησε*, 19.2; *ἀπέλουσεν*, 19.2; *αἰτεῖ*, 21.1; *κατέφαγεν*, 26.4; *ἐβορβόρυζε*, 29a.1; *ἐκέλευε*, 37.1; *ἀρειᾶι*, 41.1; *θηρεύει*, 43.1; *οἴκει*, 50.1; *παύεται*, 59.2; *ἔκρωζεν*, 61.1; *τρώγει*, 66.1; *γαμῆι*, 68.2; *ἐκφέρηι*, 68.2; *ἐσκύλευεν*, 70.8; *ὤμειξε*, 73.3; *ἐτίλησεν*, 73.3; *ἐδυσφήμει*, 78.8; *φοίτεσκε*, 78.11; *ἐδέψατ'*, 78.16; *ἀνετίλησε*, 79.6; *κατεφράσθη*, 79.13; *ἐμερμήριξε*, 79.15; *καπηλεύει*, 79.18; *εὗρε*, 79.19; *ἔβηξε*, 82.3; *ἦλθεν*, 84.2; *εἴρετ'*, 84.5; *ἔσπευδε*, 84.15; *ἐξ*[..(.)]*σεν*, 84.19; *ηὗδα*, 92.1; *συνηλοίησεν*, 92.4; *κατεῖλε*, 95.12; *ἀποπνίξηι*, 102.2; *πρῆσσε*, 102.5; *συνέτριψε*, 102.11;]*τέγραψε*, 104.3; *ἤρ*]*αξε*, 104.8; *δοκῆι*, 104.14; *ἱκέτευε*, 104.47; *θύεσκε*, 104.48; *τίλλοι*, 114a.1. *God/Mythological* (five occurrences): *ὀλέσειεν*, 25.1; *ἔστι*, 36.1; *εἶπεν*, 36.2; *ἀνεῖπεν*, 63.2; *ἀπηναρίσθη*, 72.7. *Other* (seven occurrences): *δεῖ*, 7.1; *ἦν*, 13.1; *χρή*, 26.4; *ἔσται*, 28.4; *δάκηι*, 28.6; *ῥήγνυται*, 34.4; *παρῆν*, 79.20. *Uncertain* (four occurrences):]*επλοωσεν*[, 77.3; *συρίζει*, 79.11; *ἐγένετο*, 80.1;]*είψατ'*, 80.3. PLURAL: *Human* (ten occurrences): *ἐσθίουσι*, 8.2; *ἔπινον*, 14.2; *λάβωσι*, 27.1; *περνᾶσι*, 27.1; *εἶχον*, 60.1; *φρονέουσι*, 67.1; *παρεκνημοῦντο*, 95.9; *πυκταλίζουσι*, 102.8;]..*ήσαντο*, 103.6; *ἐξορύξειαν*[, 104.35. *Other* (five occurrences): *στάζουσιν*, 57.1; *εἰσιν*, 68.1; (*ὀδόντες*) *ἐκκεκινέαται*, 73.5; *ἦλθον*, 92.11; *κατέβαλον*, 92.13.

UNCERTAIN PERSON: *οἶδ'*, 103.5.

Total: 110

APPENDIX II

TRIMETERS

The use of diction: verbs

Archilochus

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (twenty-six occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: (*μοι*) *μέλει*, 19.1; *ἀγαίομαι*, 19.2; *ἐρέω*, 19.3; *κλαίω*, 20.1; (*ἐμοὶ*) *μελήσει*, 23.10; *δοκέω*, 23.11; *ἐφαινόμην*, 23.12; *ἐπίσταμαι*, 23.14; *ἀρπαλίζομαι*, 24.4; (*μοι*) *μέλει*, 24.8; (*ἐς φάος*) *κατεστάθην*, 24.18; *ἐβουλόμην*, 48.18; *οἶδα*, 67.3; *δοκέω*, 67.4; *βουλομαι*?, 73.4. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *τετραμήνῃς*, 23.9; (*θυμὸν ἵλαον*) *τίθεο*, 23.10; *ἐπίφρασαι*, 67.6; *φρονεῖς*, 82.13. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: (*καρδίην*) *ἰαίνεται*, 25.2; *ἐτέρπετο*, 30.1; *ἀπτερύσσετο*, 41.2;[2] (*ὕβριν*) *ἀπέφλυσαν*, 45.1; *ἠράσσατο*, 48.6; *ᾐείδει*, 57.8. *God/Mythological*: *διαψέγοι*, 25.8.

Verbs of Physical Action (nineteen occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ἀνταμειβόμην*, 23.7; *εὑροίμην*, 24.11; *ἐξερύκομαι*, 27.12; *ἐδεξάμην*, 54.4. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *ἐπιστρέφεαι*, 23.17; *εἷλες*, 23.19; *ἦλθες*, 24.2; *ἐκάλλυνας*, 82.12. *God/Mythological*: *πήμαινε*, 26.6; *ὄλλυ'*, 26.6; *ὀλλύεις*, 26.6. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ἐξεπόρθησαν*, 23.18; *εἶπε*, 25.5; *ἐκλίνθησαν*, 36.1; *ἔμυζε*, 42.2; *ἀπεστύπαζον*, 47.2; *πειρήσεται*, 54.6. *God/Mythological*: *ἐρρύσατο*, 24.15; *ἔθηκεν*, 25.7.

---

[2] The verb indicates physical action (flapping of the wings), which, however, is an expression of pleasure, cf. Schol. Arat. 1009 (p. 481.13 Martin): *διακινοῦσι δὲ τὰς πτέρυγας ἤτοι ὑφ' ἡδονῆς...καὶ παρ' Ἀρχιλόχῳ ἡ ὑφ' ἡδονῆς σαλευομένη.*

Semonides

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (fourty-nine occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ἐρῷιμεν*, 1.23; *αἰκιζοίμεθα*, 1.24; *ἐνθυμοίμεθα*, 2.1; *φρονοῖμεν*, 2.2; *γινώσκομεν*, 7.114; *ἐπίσταμαι*, 24.2. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *γαυρία*, 10a.1; *θαύμαζε*, 10a.2; *προυκπονέαι*, 22.1. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: (*ἡμέρας*, *περιτροπὰς*) *μένουσιν*, 1.8; *δοκεῖ*, 1.9; (*μιν κακῶν*) *λέληθεν*, 7.9; *πιθοίατο*, 1.22; (*ὀργὴν*) *ἔχει*, 7.11; *θέλει*, 7.13; *λέληκεν*, 7.15; *ὁρᾶι*, 7.15; *οἶδε*, 7.23; *ἐπίσταται*, 7.24; *ἕλκεται*, 7.26; *νοεῖ*, 7.27; *γελᾶι*, 7.28; *γέγηθεν*, 7.28; *ἐπαινέσει*, 7.29; *μαίνεται*, 7.33; *μαίνεται*, 7.39; *ἔοικε*, 7.41; *ἔστερξεν*, 7.45; *ἐδέξατο*, 7.49; (*ναυσίηι*) *διδοῖ*, 7.54; (*φίλον*) *ποιεῖται*, 7.62; *ἀγλαΐζεται*, 7.70; *ἐπίσταται*, 7.78; (*οἱ*) *μέλει*, 7.79; *βουλεύεται*, 7.81; *εὐτυχεῖ*, 7.83; *ἥδεται*, 7.90; *δοκέωσι*, 7.97; (*εὔφρων*) *διέρχεται*, 7.99; *δοκῆι*, 7.103; *κορύσσεται*, 7.105; *δεκοίατο*, 7.107; *δοκεῖ*, 7.108; *χαίρουσ'*, 7.111; *ἁμαρτάνει*, 7.111; *αἰνέσει*, 7.112; *μωμήσεται*, 7.113; *ἔδεισεν*, 14.2. *God/Mythological*: *χαρίζεται*, 7.92.

Verbs of Physical Action (fourty-nine occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ἀνέδραμον*, 10.1; *ἀλειφόμην*, 16.1; *ἠλσάμην*, 17.1; *κατήγαγον*, 23.2; *ἀπεῦσα*, 24.1; *ἐμίστυλα*, 24.1. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *ἔντυε*, 10a.3. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ἅψαντο*, 1.18; *λείπουσιν*, 1.19; *ληΐζεται*, 6.1; *πιαίνεται*, 7.6; *εἶπε*, 7.10; *παύσειε*, 7.16; *ἐξαράξειεν*, 7.17; (*αὐονὴν*) *ἔχει*, 7.20; *ἐπονήσατο*, 7.45; *ἐσθίει*, 7.46; *ἐσθίει*, 7.47; *ἔρδει*, 7.55; *κατεσθίει*, 7.56; *περιτρέπει*, 7.58; *ψαύσειεν*, 7.59; *ἄρειεν*, 7.60; *βάλοι*, 7.60; *ἵζοιτ'*, 7.62; *λοῦται*, 7.63; *ἀλείφεται*, 7.64; *φορεῖ*, 7.65; *εἶσιν*, 7.74; *κινεῖται*, 7.75; *ἀγκαλίζεται*, 7.77; *ἔρξειεν*, 7.82; *λέγουσι*, 7.91; *ἀπώσεται*, 7.101; *ἔδωκεν*, 25.1; *εἷλε*, 26.1. *God/Mythological*: *ἔχει*, 1.1; *τίθησ'*, 1.2; *ἐκτελευτήσει*, 1.5; *πέμπει*, 1.14; *ἐποίησεν*, 7.1; *ἔθηκ'*, 7.7; *ἔδωκαν*, 7.22; *ποιήσηι*, 7.25; *ὤπασεν*, 7.72; *ἐποίησεν*, 7.96; *ἐποίησεν*, 7.115; *ἀμφέθηκεν*, 7.116; *ἐδέξατο*, 7.117.

Solon

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (nine occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ὑπεσχόμην*, 36.17; *ἤθελον*, 36.22; (*ὡς λύκος*) *ἐστράφην*, 36.27. SECOND PERSON: no occurrences. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: (*τοῖς ἐναντίοις*) *ἥνδανεν*, 36.23; *φρασαίατο*, 36.24; *εἶδον*, 37.3;

αἰνοῖεν, 37.5; (*φίλον*) *ποιοίατο*, 37.5. *God/Mythological*: *συμμαρτυροίη*, 36.3.

Verbs of Physical Action (fourteen occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ξυνήγαγον*, 36.1; *ἐπαυσάμην*, 36.2; *ἀνεῖλον*, 36.6; *ἀνήγαγον*, 36.9; *ἔθηκα*, 36.15; *ἔρεξα*, 36.17; *ἔγραψα*, 36.20; SECOND PERSON: no occurrences. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *κατέσχε*, 36.22; *κατέσχε*, 37.7; *ἐπαύσατο*, 37.7; *ἐξεῖλεν*, 37.8; *πίνουσι*, 38.1; *τρώγουσι*, 38.1; *σπεύδουσι*, 39.1.

Hipponax

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (fourteen occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: (*μοι*) *δοκεῖ*, 30.1; *ἐπεύχομαι*, 32.2; *λίσσομαι*, 40.2; *δέδοικ'*, 73.7. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *θέλεις*, 44.1. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *αἰτεῖ*, 21.1; *ἀρειᾶι*, 41.1; *φρονέουσι*, 67.1; *ἐδυσφήμει*, 78.8; *κατεφράσθη?*, 79.13; *ἐμερμήριξε*, 79.15; *δοκῆι*, 104.14; *ἱκέτευε*, 104.47. UNCERTAIN PERSON: *οἶδ'*, 103.5.

Verbs of Physical Action (seventy-one occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *κατηυλίσθην*, 16.2; *ῥιγῶ*, 32.2; *βαμβαλύζω*, 32.3; *ἐρέω*, 35.1; *δώσω*, 39.1; *ποιήσωμαι*, 39.3; *δώσω*, 44.1; *φοιτῶ*, 73.6; *ἐδάκνομεν*, 84.11; *ἐφιλέομεν*, 84.11; *ἐβίνεον*, 84.16; *ἐξέδυσα*, 104.17; *ἐπάκτωσα*, 104.19; *ἤλειφον*, 104.22. *God/Mythological*: *δίδωμι*, 36.3. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *συνοίκησας*, 15.1; *γράψηις*, 28.1; *προσκυνήσεις*, 47.2; *καλύπτεαι*, 52.1. *God/Mythological*: *δός*, 32.4; *ἔδωκας*, 34.1; *ἔκρυψας*, 34.4; *ἔδωκας*, 38.2; *ἀποπέμψηις*, 39.2. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *κατέκτεινεν*, 1.1; *ἔβωσε*, 3.1; *ἐσθίουσι*, 8.2; *ῥαπισθείη*, 10.2; *κατήραξε*, 13.2; *ἔπινον*, 14.2; *προὔπινεν*, 14.3; *ἔψησε*, 19.2; *ἀπέλουσεν*, 19.2; *κατέφαγεν*, 26.4; *λάβωσι*, 27.1; *περνᾶσι*, 27.1; *ἐβορβόρυζε*, 29a.1; *ἐκέλευε*, 37.1; *θηρεύει*, 43.1; *οἴκει*, 50.1; *παύεται*, 59.2; *ἔκρωζεν*, 61.1; *τρώγει*, 66.1; *γαμῆι*, 68.2; *ἐκφέρηι*, 68.2; *ἐσκύλευεν*, 70.8; *ὤμειξε*, 73.3; *ἐτίλησεν*, 73.3; *φοίτεσκε*, 78.11; *ἐδέψατ'*, 78.16; *ἀνετίλησε*, 79.6; *καπηλεύει*, 79.18; *εὗρε*, 79.19; *ἔβηξε*, 82.3; *ἦλθεν*, 84.2; *εἷρετ'*, 84.5; *ἔσπευδε*, 84.15; *ηὗδα*, 92.1; *συνηλοίησεν*, 92.4; *παρεκνημοῦντο*, 95.9; *κατεῖλε*, 95.12; *ἀποπνίξηι*, 102.2; *πρῆσσε*, 102.5; *πυκταλίζουσι*, 102.8; *συνέτριψε*, 102.11; *ἐξορύξειαν*, 104.35; *θύεσκε*, 104.48; *τίλλοι*, 114a.1. *God/Mythological*: *ὀλέσειεν*, 25.1; *εἶπεν*, 36.2; *ἀνεῖπεν*, 63.2; *ἀπηναρίσθη*, 72.7.

APPENDIX III

TRIMETERS

The use of diction: nouns

Note on the classification of nouns:

The examples below are taken from both the trimeters and elegy.[3]

"Intangibles" refers to nouns signifying: a) condition (political, social, etc.): *τυραννίδος*, Arch. 19.3; *διχοστασίη*, Sol. 4.37; *κακότητα*, Thgn. 42; *πλοῦτος*, Thgn. 190; b) abstractions: *ἀληθείη*, Arch. 23.16; *φιλότης*, Mimn. 1.3; *ἀρετήν*, Thgn. 129; c) forces (natural, human, divine, social): *θανάτου*, Tyrt. 7.2; *αἶσαν*, Sol. 4.2; *ὕβριος*, Sol. 4.8; *ἄτην*, Sol. 13.68; *μοῖρα*, Tyrt. 7.2; *γῆρας*, Mimn. 1.10; *ἥβης*, Mimn. 1.4; *αἰδώς*, Tyrt. 10.12; d) mental entities, processes, feeling: *μηχανή*, Sem. 7.94; *γνώμας*, Thgn. 60; *ὀργήν*, Thgn. 214; *μέριμνας*, Mimn. 1.7; *νόον*, Thgn. 36; *θυμόν*, Thgn. 81.

"Tangibles/perceptibles" refers to: a) "man-made," signifying not only physical artifacts but also other perceptible entities, such as *λόγωι*, Arch. 23.16; *ἔπεα*, Tyrt. 4.2; also natural objects manipulated by men, such as *ἄρουρα*, Tyrt. 6.3; *ἀγρούς*, Tyrt. 10.3; *πῖαρ*, Sol. 37.8; *γάλα*, 37.8; fruit and animals/parts used as food, sacrifice, for instance, *σῦκα*, Hip. 26.5; *λαγούς*, Hip. 26a.1; *μηρία*, Cal. 2a.1. b) "natural," signifying animals, human body, elements of the natural environment.

Not included: any nouns signifying humans, gods, and mythological figures, such as: *ἀνήρ, γυνή, βασιλεύς, ἡγεμών, φώς, φίλος, ἀθάνατος, θνητός, μάντις, μούναρχος*, etc.

δῆμος and *λαός* are taken as abstract. *πόλεμος* is understood as indicating condition as opposed to *μάχη*, signifying physical action.

Context determines whether a noun is taken as "intangible," "man-made" or "natural." Examples: *πῦρ* is considered "natural" in Sol. 13.14 but "man-made" in Sem. 7.26, Hip. 78.10; *πόλις* can be both an

[3] The same principles of classification are also used for the nouns in elegy, see Appendix VI.

abstraction (more frequently so, e.g., Arch. 13.2; Sol. 4.1; Thgn. 43, 52, 53, etc.) and an artifact/buildings (Arch. 49.7; Hip. 50.1; Sol. 19.2); the same applies to *ἄστυ*, which can be both an abstraction (Sol. 4.21; Tyrt. 12.24) and a man-made entity/buildings (Mimn. 9.1). *εὐνή* is taken both as an object/bed (Mimn. 12.5) and "intangible" (metaphorical), marriage, sex (Mimn. 1.3).

χρῆμα: in the singular it is undertstood as "intangible" but in the plural (*χρήματα*), for the sake of uniformity, as "money" ("man-made"), with the understanding that it may also mean "possessions," "goods."

Archilochus

INTANGIBLES: (twenty occurrences)
ζῆλος, 19.2; *ἔργα*, 19.3; *τυραννίδος*, 19.3; *κακά*, 20.1; *φάτιν*, 23.8; *θυμόν*, 23.10; *ἀνολβίης*, 23.11; *ἀληθείῃ*, 23.16; *κλέος*, 23.19; *τυραννίην*, 23.20; *μηχανή*, 24.10; *ἥβην*, 24.14; *φυή*, 25.1; *καρδίην*, 25.2; *χάρις*, 27.14; *ἔργων*, 35.2; *ὕβριν*, 45.1; *ψιῆισιν*, 48.20; *τέχνην*, 58.9; *δίκην*, 82.5.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (twenty-one occurrences): *λόγωι*, 23.16; *πόλιν*, 23.17; *αἰχμῆι*, 23.19; *νηΐ*, 24.1; *φορτίων*, 24.8; *οἰκίηι*, 35.1; *τοῖχον*, 36.1; *αὐλήν*, 37.1; *ἕρκος*, 37.1; *αὐλῶι*, 42.1; *βρῦτον*, 42.1; *σωλῆνος*, 46.1; *ἄγγος*, 46.1; *θυρέων*, 47.2; *δαῖτα*, 48.2; *ἀκάτια*, 48.25; *πόλιν*, 49.7; *λύρην*, 54.11; *λίνου*, 67.8; *ἤϊα*, 79.1; *πόλιν*, 82.12.
Natural (thirty-seven occurrences): *ὀφθαλμῶν*, 19.4; *ὄνου*, 21.1; *ῥάχις*, 21.1; *ὕλης*, 21.2; *χῶρος*, 22.1; *εὐφρόνηι*, 23.9; *μύρμηξ*, 23.16; *πόντον*, 24.2; *κῦμ'*, 24.12; *ἁλός*, 24.12; *χερσίν*, 24.13; *ζόφωι*, 24.17; *φάος*, 24.18; *σάθη*, 25.3; *θαλλόν*, 30.1; *μυρσίνης*, 30.1; *ῥοδῆς*, 30.2; *ἄνθος*, 30.2; *κόμη*, 31.1; *ὤμους*, 31.2; *μετάφρενα*, 31.2; *μύρτον*, 32.1; *βοῦς*, 35.1; *ἐπείσιον*, 40.1; *κηρύλος*, 41.1; *πέτρης*, 41.2; *σάθη*, 43.1; *ὄνου*, 43.2; *ἀφρός*, 44.1; *στόμα*, 44.1; *κόμην*, 48.5; *στῆθος*, 48.6; *πνοαί*, 51.4; *αὐχέν'*, 54.5; *μηρῶν*, 66.1; *φυτοῦ*, 67.3; *σάθης*, 82.4.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (three occurrences)
ῥοάς, 22.2; *τομῆι*, 67.1; *ἴησιν*, 67.4.

Semonides

INTANGIBLES: (sixty-nine occurrences)
τέλος, 1.1; *νοῦς*, 1.3; *ἐλπίς*, 1.6; *νέωτα*, 1.9; *ἐτέων*, 1.9; *ἀγαθοῖσιν*, 1.10; *γῆρας*, 1.11; *τέρμ'*, 1.12; *νοῦσοι*, 1.13; *μόρωι*, 1.18; *κακῶν*, 1.20; *κῆρες*, 1.21; *δύαι*, 1.21; *πήματ'*, 1.22; *κακῶν*, 1.23; *ἄλγεσιν*, 1.23; *θυμόν*, 1.24; *χρόνος*, 3.1; *ἀριθμῶι*, 3.2; *ἔτεα*, 3.2; *χρῆμ'*, 6.1; *νόον*, 7.1; *κακῶν*, 7.8; *ἀμεινόνων*, 7.9; *κακόν*, 7.10; *ἐσθλόν*, 7.11; *ὀργήν*,7.11; *κακόν*, 7.22; *ἐσθλόν*, 7.23; *ἔργων*, 7.24; *φρεσίν*, 7.27; *ἀποθυμίη*, 7.35; *χάρμα*, 7.38; *ὥρηι*, 7.39; *ὀργήν*, 7.42; *φυήν*, 7.42; *ἀνάγκηι*, 7.44; *ἔργον*, 7.48; *γένος*, 7.50; (*ἀφροδισίης*) *εὐνῆς*, 7.53; *ναυσίηι*, 7.54; *κακά*, 7.55; *ἔργα*, 7.58; *δύην*, 7.58; *ἀνάγκηι*, 7.62; *θέημα*, 7.67; *κακόν*, 7.68; *θυμόν*, 7.70; *κακόν*, 7.72; *ἄστεος*, 7.74; *κακόν*, 7.77; *δήνεα*, 7.78; *τρόπους*, 7.78; *κακόν*, 7.82; *μῶμος*, 7.84; *βίος*, 7.85; *γένος*, 7.87; *χάρις*, 7.89; *φῦλα*, 7.94; *μηχανῆι*, 7.94; *κακόν*, 7.96; *κακόν*, 7.98; *μοῖραν*, 7.104; *χάριν*, 7.104; *μῶμον*, 7.105; *μοῖραν*, 7.114; *κακόν*, 7.115; *δεσμόν*, 7.116; *βίον*, 13.2.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (forty-one occurrences): *ἀγχόνην*, 1.18; *οἶκον*, 7.3; *εἵμασιν*, 7.5; *δίφρον*, 7.26; *πυρός*, 7.26; *δόμοις*, 7.29; *μυχῶι*, 7.46; *ἐσχάρηι*, 7.47; *ἱρά*, 7.56; *μύλης*, 7.59; *κόσκινον*, 7.59; *οἴκου*, 7.60; *ἰπνόν*, 7.61; *ἀσβόλην*, 7.61; *ῥύπον*, 7.63; *μύροις*, 7.64; *λόγους*, 7.91; *οἰκίης*, 7.101; *οἶκον*, 7.104; *οἰκίην*, 7.106; *πέδην*, 7.116; *λόγων*, 10.1; *ῥύπωι*, 10a.3; *χιτῶνος*, 10a.3; *ἀτραπῶι*, 14.3; *μύροισι*, 16.1; *θυώμασιν*, 16.1; *βακκάρι*, 16.2; *ὀρσοθύρης*, 17.1; *εἵμασιν*, 21a.1; *εἵμασιν*, 21b.1; *τυρός*, 23.1; *κρέα*, 24.1; *ἀρυστῆρα*, 25.1; *τρυγός*, 25.1; *τράπεζα*, 26.1; *ποτήρια*, 26.1; (*κύλικος*) *χεῖλος*, 27.1; *κύλιξ*, 27.1; (*δεδαυμένων*) *μηρίων*, 30.1; *ξύλα*, 31a.1.
Natural (sixty-five occurrences): *βοτά*, 1.4; *ἡμέρην*, 1.7; *χθονός*, 1.14; *θαλάσσηι*, 1.15; *λαίλαπι*, 1.15; *κύμασιν*, 1.16; *ἁλός*, 1.16; *ἡλίου*, 1.19; *φάος*, 1.19; *ἡμέρης*, 2.2; *ὑός*, 7.2; *βορβόρωι*, 7.3; *κοπρίηισιν*, 7.6; *ἀλώπεκος*, 7.7; *κυνός*, 7.12; *λίθωι*, 7.17; *ὀδόντας*, 7.18; *χειμῶνα*, 7.25; *θαλάσσης*, 7.27; *ἡμέρην*, 7.28; *ὀφθαλμοῖς*, 7.32; *κύων*, 7.34; *θάλασσα*, 7.37; *θέρεος*, 7.39; *κύμασιν*, 7.40; *πόντος*, 7.42; *ὄνου*, 7.43; *γαλῆς*, 7.50; *ἵππος*, 7.57; *κόπρον*, 7.60; *ἡμέρης*, 7.63; *χαίτην*, 7.65; *ἀνθέμοισιν*, 7.66; *πιθήκου*, 7.71; *πρόσωπα*, 7.73; *αὐχένα*, 7.75; *πίθηκος*, 7.79; *ἡμέρην*, 7.81; *μελίσσης*, 7.83; *ἡμέρην*, 7.99; *ἔγχελυς*, 8.1; *γλοιοῦ*, 8.1; *ἐρωιδιός*, 9.1; *ἔγχελυν*, 9.1; *ὕδωρ*, 10a.1; *γενειάδα*,

10a.2; *χρόα*, 10a.3; *χηνός*, 11.1; *ὤεον*, 11.1; *σπλάγχν'*, 12.1; *ἰκτίνου*, 12.1; *ἑρπετόν*, 13.1; *ζωΐων*, 13.2; *οὔρεσιν*, 14.1; *λέοντ'*, 14.2; *πάρδαλιν*, 14.2; *θύννοισι*, 15.1; *τευθίς*, 15.1; *κωβιοῖσι*, 15.1; *κωρίδες*, 15.1; *ἵππος*, 18.1; *αἷμ'*, 20.2; *ὗν*, 24.1; *ὁπλάς*, 28.1; *ποδῶν*, 28.1.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (five occurrences)
περιτροπάς, 1.8; *αὐονήν*, 7.20; *γέλως*, 7.74; *γέλως*, 7.79; *μάχην*, 7.105.

Solon

INTANGIBLES: (nineteen occurrences)
δῆμον, 36.2; *δίκηι*, 36.3; *πατρίδ'*, 36.8; *χρειοῦς*, 36.11; (*Ἀττικὴν*) *γλῶσσαν*, 36.11; *δουλίην*, 36.13; *ἤθη*, 36.14; *κράτει*, 36.15; *βίην*, 36.16; *δίκην*, 36.16; *θεσμούς*, 36.18; *δίκην*, 36.19; *δῆμον*, 36.22; *πόλις*, 36.25; *ἀλκήν*, 36.26; *δήμωι*, 37.1; *βίην*, 37.4; *τιμῆς*, 37.6; *δῆμον*, 37.7.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (sixteen occurrences): *ὅρους*, 36.6; *κέντρον*, 36.20; *πῖαρ*, 37.8; *γάλα*, 37.8; *μεταιχμίωι*, 37.9; *ὅρος*, 37.10; *ἴτρια*, 38.1; *ἄρτον*, 38.2; *γούρους*, 38.3; *φακοῖσι*, 38.3; *πεμμάτων*, 38.3; *ἴγδιν*, 39.1; *σίλφιον*, 39.1; *ὄξος*, 39.2; *κόκκωνας*, 40.1; *σήσαμα*, 40.1.
Natural (four occurrences): *κυσίν*, 36.27; *λύκος*, 36.27; *ὀφθαλμοῖσιν*, 37.2; *γῆ*, 38.4.

Hipponax

INTANGIBLES: (thirteen occurrences)
λιμῶι, 10.1; *κλῆρον*, 26.4; *συμφορή*, 28.4; (*ῥίγεος*) *φάρμακον*, 34.2; *φρένας*, 36.4; *ψυχήν*, 39.1; (*πονηρίης*) *φάρμακον*, 39.4; *πονηρίης*, 39.4; *γενήν*, 75.5; *μῆνα*, 78.12; *ἀνοΐης*, 79.3; *ἔργοισιν*, 84.20; *πόνοισι*, 92.6.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (one hundred and thirteen occurrences): *λῶπος*, 2.1; *δάφνας*, 4.2; *πόλιν*, 5.1; *κράδηισι*, 5.1; *κράδηισι*, 6.2; *σκίλληισι*, 6.2; *ἰσχάδας*, 8.1; *μᾶζαν*, 8.1; *τυρόν*, 8.2; *κράδας*, 9.2; *ἄρτον*, 12.3; *πελλίδος*, 13.1; *κύλιξ*, 13.2; *πέλλης*, 14.1; *λύχνον*, 17.1; *βακτηρίηι*, 20.1; *ἡμίεκτον*, 21.1; *θύνναν*, 26.2; *μυσσωτόν*, 26.2; *σῦκα*, 26.5; *κόλλικα*, 26.6; *χόρτον*, 26.6; *ἀτταγέας*, 26a.1; *λαγούς*, 26a.1; *τηγανίτας*, 26a.2; *σησάμοισι*, 26a.2; *ἀττανίτας*, 26a.3; *κηρίοισιν*,

26a.3; *τριήρεος*, 28.2; *τοίχωι*, 28.2; *ἐμβόλου*, 28.3; *κύθρος*, 29a.1; *ἔτνεος*, 29a.1; *δούμωι*, 30.2; *χλαῖναν*, 32.4; *κυπασσίσκον*, 32.4; *σαμβαλίσκα*, 32.5; *ἀσκερίσκα*, 32.5; *χρυσοῦ*, 32.5; *στατῆρας*, 32.6; *τοίχου*, 32.6; *χλαῖναν*, 34.1; *ἀσκέρηισι*, 34.3; *μνέας*, 36.3; *ἀργύρου*, 36.3; *χρυσόν*, 38.2; *ἀργύρου*, 38.2; *κριθέων*, 39.2; *μέδιμνον*, 39.3; *ἀλφίτων*, 39.3; *κυκεῶνα*, 39.4; *τύμβον*, 42.2; *σῆμα*, 42.3; *στήλην*, 42.3; *μνῆμα*, 42.4; *πόλιος*, 50.1; *μάλθηι*, 51.1; *τρόπιν*, 51.1; *σίφωνι*, 56.1; *ἐπίθημα*, 56.1; *σάκκος*, 57.1; *ἄλειφα*, 58.1; *λέκος*, 58.1; *πυροῦ*, 58.1; *μαρίλην*, 59.1; *στέφανον*, 60.1; *λαύρηι*, 61.1; *ταμείωι*, 62.1; *χαυμενίωι*, 62.1; *πρύμνης*, 65.1; *χάλιν*, 67.1; *ἁρμάτων*, 72.5; *πύργων*, 72.6; *ψωμόν*, 75.4; *μαρίλην*, 78.9; *ἀνθράκων*, 78.9; *πῦρ*, 78.10; *πυρρόν*, 78.10; *ἀθερίνην*, 78.11; *οἶκον*, 78.13; *συκάμινα*, 78.13; *κιμαίωι*, 78.14; *μαρίλην*, 78a.1; *ἀνθράκων*, 78a.1; *ῥάβδωι*, 79.7; *ἑρμῖνος*, 79.8; *ἔρπιν*, 79.18; *στέγην*, 78.19; *ὄφελμα*, 79.20; *πυθμένι*, 79.20; *στοιβῆς*, 79.20; *κυσοχήνηι*, 82.2; *γληχῶνος*, 84.4; *θυρέων*, 84.12; *ἀλλᾶντα*, 84.17; *χλαίνας*, 85c.3; *κράδηι*, 92.4; *διοζίοισιν*, 92.5; *κράδη*, 92.7; *βολβίτωι*, 92.9; *λαύρη*, 92.10; *ὀδμήν*, 92.11; *θύρας*, 92.14; *μήνυτρον*, 102.4; *σπλάχνοισιν*, 102.9; *ἀσβόλου*, 103.10; *χλαῖναν*, 104.17; *θύρην*, 104.19; *πῦρ*, 104.20; *βακκάρι*, 104.21; *κνίσην*, 104.37; *στατῆρας*, 105.8; *κρέας*, 114b.1.

Natural (seventy-one occurrences): *διάσφαγμα*, 2a.1; *χειμῶνι*, 6.1; *θύμωι*, 10.1; *ῥωιδιῶι*, 16.2; *φαλέω*, 21.1; *ῥῖνα*, 22.1; *μύξαν*, 22.1; *ἡμέρας*, 26.2; *πέτρας*, 26.5; *ὄπφιν*, 28.2; *κληδών*, 28.4; *ὄπφις*, 28.6; *ἀντικνήμιον*, 28.6; *χειμῶνι*, 34.2; *ῥίγεος*, 34.2; *πόδας*, 34.3; *χίμετλα*, 34.4; *ἥλιον*, 42.5; *γαστέρα*, 42.5; *ἡμέρην*, 47.1; *συκῆν*, 48.1; *ἀμπέλου*, 48.1; *ἀκτῆς*, 50.2; *χαραδριόν*, 52.1; *φοῖδας*, 59.1; *κοκκυμήλων*, 60.1; *μίνθης*, 60.1; *κύμινδις*, 61.1; *ἄκρης*, 65.1; *θάλασσαν*, 65.1; *κύων*, 66.1; *ἡμέραι*, 68.1; *βρύσσον*, 70.8; *πώλων*, 72.5; *αἷμα*, 73.3; *χολήν*, 73.3; *ὀδόντες*, 73.4; *γνάθοισι*, 73.5; *σέλας*, 78.10; *κανθαρο*[78.12; *ῥῖνα*, 78.14; *γνάθον*, 79.4; *κυνός*, 79.10; *ἔχιδνα*, 79.11; *νυκτί*, 79.12; *μυῖαν*, 79.16; *σελήνην*, 82.4; *ἄκρον*, 84.17; *πυγεῶνα*, 92.2; *ὄρχιν*, 92.3; *κάνθαροι*, 92.10; *χοίρου*, 102.9; *ὕδρον*, 102.10; *καρκίνον*, 102.11; *τράχηλον*, 103.1; *νησῖδα*, 103.3; *θαλάσσης*, 103.7; *καρκίνωι*, 103.8; *γρόμφιν*, 103.11; *δακτύλους*, 104.10; *γαστρί*, 104.13; *πόδας*, 104.18; *ῥῖνας*, 104.21; *πρωκτῶι*, 104.32; *νήσου*, 104.36; *κράμβην*, 104.47; *μέτωπον*, 104.50; *πλευράς*, 104.50; *κυνός*, 105.9; *τράμιν*, 114a.1; *συός*, 114b.1.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (two occurrences)
κριγή, 54.1; *σπονδῆι*, 102.9.

APPENDIX IV

ELEGY

The use of the person of the verb

Archilochus

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (eight occurrences): *εἰμί*, 1.1; *πίνω*, 2.2; *κάλλιπον*, 5.2; *ἐξεσάωσα*, 5.3; (*μοι*) *μέλει*, 5.3; *κτήσομαι*, 5.4; *ἵησομαι*, 11.1; *θήσω*, 11.2. *PLURAL*: *Human* (four occurrences): *δυνησόμεθα*, 4.9; *κρύπτομεν*, 12.1; *ἔχομεν*, 13.4; *ἀναστένομεν*, 13.8.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (four occurrences): *ἄγε*, 4.6; *φοίτα*, 4.7; *ἄφελκε*, 4.7; *ἄγρει*, 4.8. *PLURAL*: *Human* (one occurrence): *τλῆτε*, 13.10.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (five occurrences): *ἀγάλλεται*, 5.1; *τέρψεται*, 13.2; *ἔχει*, 13.7; *πάθοι*, 14.2; *μάχηται*, 15.1. *God*/*Mythological* (two occurrences): *συνάγηι*, 3.2; *ἀμφεπονήθη*, 9.11. *Other* (six occurrences): *ἔσεται*, 3.3; *ἐρρέτω*, 5.4; *τεύχει*, 17.1; *ἔκλυσεν*, 13.4; *ἐτράπεθ'*, 13.8; *ἐπαμείψεται*, 13.9; *Uncertain* (one occurrence):]*ελιπεν*, 9.2. *PLURAL*: *Human* (one occurrence): *εἰσι*, 3.4. *God*/*Mythological* (two occurrences): *ἔθεσαν*, 13.6; *δίδωσιν*, 16.1. *Other* (one occurrence): (*τόξα*) *ἐπιτανύσσεται*, 3.1.

Total: 35

Callinus

FIRST PERSON: no occurrences.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *God* (two occurrences): *ἐλέησον*, 2.1; *μνῆσαι*, 2a.1. *PLURAL*: *Human* (four occurrences): *κατάκεισθε*, 1.1; *ἕξετε*, 1.1; *αἰδεῖσθ'*, 1.2; *δοκεῖτε*, 1.3.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (eight occurrences): *ἀκοντισάτω*, 1.5; *ἴτω*, 1.9; *ἧι*, 1.13; *ἔρχεται*, 1.15; *στενάχει*, 1.17; *πάθηι*, 1.17; *ἔρδει*, 1.21; *ἔρχεται*, 5.1. *Other* (five occurrences): *ἔχει*, 1.4; *ἐστι*, 1.6; *ἔσεται*, 1.8; *ἐστίν*, 1.12; *κίχεν*, 1.15. *PLURAL*: *Human* (two occurrences): *ὁρῶσι*, 1.20; *κατέκηαν*, 2a.2. *God/Mythological* (one occurrence): *ἐπικλώσωσ'*, 1.9.

Total: 22

Tyrtaeus

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (two occurrences): *μνησαίμην*, 12.1; *τιθείην*, 12.1. *PLURAL*: *Human* (eight occurrences): *πειθώμεθα*, 2.10; *ἀφικόμεθα*, 2.15; *εἵλομεν*, 5.2; *μαχώμεθα*, 10.13; *θνήσκωμεν*, 10.14; *πεισόμεθ'*, 19.11; *ἀλοιησέομεν*, 19.12; *]συνοίσομεν*, 20.15.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: no occurrences. *PLURAL*: *Human* (fourteen occurrences): *μάχεσθε*, 10.15; *ἄρχετε*, 10.16; *ποιεῖσθε*, 10.17; *φιλοψυχεῖτ'*, 10.18; *φεύγετε*, 10.20; *ἐστέ*, 11.1; *θαρσεῖτ'*, 11.2; *δειμαίνετε*, 11.3; *φοβεῖσθε*, 11.3; *ἴστε*, 11.7; *ἐδάητ'*, 11.8; *ἐγένεσθε*, 11.9; *ἠλάσατε*, 11.10; *βάλλετε*, 11.36.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (fourty-two occurrences): *μετέσσεται*, 10.7; *ἵκηται*, 10.7; *αἰσχύνει*, 10.9; *ἐλέγχει*, 10.9; *ἔχηι*, 10.28; *μενέτω*, 10.31; *ἐχέτω*, 11.4; *ἀνύσειεν*, 11.15; *μάθηι*, 11.16; *μενέτω*, 11.21; *τινασσέτω*, 11.25; *κινείτω*, 11.26; *διδασκέσθω*, 11.27; *ἐστάτω*, 11.28; *ἑλέτω*, 11.30; *μαχέσθω*, 11.33; *ἔχοι*, 12.3; *νικώιη*, 12.4; *εἴη*, 12.5; *πλουτοίη*, 12.6; *εἴη*, 12.7; *ἔχοι*, 12.8; *ἔχοι*, 12.9; *γίνεται*, 12.10; *τετλαίη*, 12.11; *ὀρέγοιτ'*, 12.12; *μένηι*, 12.16; *λάθηται*, 12.17; *θαρσύνηι*, 12.19; *γίνεται*, 12.20; *ἔτρεψε*, 12.21; *ἔσχεθε*, 12.22; *ὤλεσε*, 12.23; *κέκηδε*, 12.28; *γίνεται*, 12.32; *φύγηι*, 12.35; *ἕληι*, 12.36; *ἔρχεται*, 12.38; *μετατρέπει*, 12.39; *ἐθέλει*, 12.40; *πειράσθω*, 12.44; *λογήσει*, 20.17. *God/Mythological* (four occurrences): *δέδωκε*, 2.13; *ἀνέφηνε*, 4.10; *ἔχει*, 11.2; *ὀλέσηι*, 12.34. *Other* (eleven occurrences): *φέρει*, 6.3; *κίχοι*, 7.2; *ἔστ'*, 10.4; *ἕπεται*, 10.10; *γίνεται*, 10.12; *ἀπόλωλ'*, 11.14; *ἐστι*, 11.17; *ἐστί*, 11.19; *γίνεται*, 12.14; *ἀπόλλυται*, 12.31; *ἔσται*, 19.14. *PLURAL*: *Human* (fourteen occurrences): *ἔνεικαν*, 4.1; (*οἷσι*) *μέλει*, 4.4; *ἐμάχοντ'*, 5.4; *φεῦγον*, 5.8; (*νέοισι πάντ'*) *ἐπέοικεν*, 10.27; *τολμῶσι*, 11.11;

θνήσκουσι, 11.13; *σαοῦσι*, 11.13; *ὀλοφύρονται*, 12.27; *τιμῶσιν*, 12.37; *εἴκουσ'*, 12.42; *]ήσουσιν*, 19.16; *ἐρωήσουσιν*, 19.18; *λείψουσ'*, 23.13. *God/Mythological*? (one occurrence): (*οἷσι*) *μέλει*, 21.15. *Other* (two occurrences): (*κακὰ*) *γίνεται*, 11.16; *ἕξουσι*, 19.20.

Total: 98

Mimnermus

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (five occurrences): *τεθναίην*, 1.2; (*μοι*) *μέλοι*, 1.2; *ῥέει* (*μοι ἱδρώς*), 5.1; *πτοιῶμαι*, 5.2; *πεύθομαι*, 14.2. *PLURAL*: *Human* (four occurrences): *τερπόμεθα*, 2.4; *ἀφικόμεθα*, 9.2; *ἑζόμεθ'*, 9.4; *εἵλομεν*, 9.6.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (one occurrence): *τέρπε*, 7.1. *PLURAL*: no occurrences.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (eleven occurrences): *τέρπεται*, 1.8; *τρυχοῦται*, 2.12; *ἐπιδεύεται*, 2.13; *ἔρχεται*, 2.14; *ἔχει*, 2.15; *ἐστιν*, 2.15; *ἐρεῖ*, 7.2; *ἐνεδέξατο*, 13a.1; *σεύαιθ'*, 14.7; *ἔσκεν*, 14.10; *φέρετ'*, 14.11. *God/Mythological* (eleven occurrences): *ἔθηκε*, 1.10; *διδοῖ*, 2.16; *ἔδωκεν*, 4.1; *ἀνήγαγεν*, 11.1; *ᾤχετο*, 11a.3; *ἔλαχεν*, 12.1; (*ἄμπαυσις*) *γίνεται* (*αὐτῶι*), 12.2; *εἰσαναβῆι*, 12.4; *μόληι*, 12.10; *ἐπέβη*, 12.11; *ἐμέμψατο*, 14.5. *Other* (seventeen occurrences): *ἐπέλθηι*, 1.5; *τιθεῖ*, 1.6; *φύει*, 2.1; *γίνεται*, 2.7; *κίδναται*, 2.8; *παραμείψεται*, 2.9; *γίνεται*, 2.11; *παραμείψεται*, 3.1; *ὤφελεν*, 5.3; *γίνεται*, 5.4; *ὑπερκρέμαται*, 5.6; *τιθεῖ*, 5.7; *βλάπτει*, 5.8; *κίχοι*, 6.2; *παρέστω*, 8.1; *φέρει*, 12.5; *ἔχει*, 15.1. *PLURAL*: *Human* (two occurrences): *ἤϊξαν*, 13a.2; *ἴδον*, 14.2. *God/Mythological* (two occurrences): *παρεστήκασι*, 2.5; *ἵκοντο*, 11.4; *Other* (six occurrences): *γίνεται*, 1.4; *τείρουσι*, 1.7; *αὔξεται*, 2.2; *πέλει*, 2.12; *κείαται*, 11a.2; *ἑστᾶσ'*, 12.10.

Total: 59

Solon

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (twelve occurrences): *ἦλθον*, 1.1; *εἴην*, 2.1; *γινώσκω*, 4a.1; *ἔδωκα*, 5.1; *ἐφρασάμην*, 5.4; *ἔστην*, 5.5;

εἴασ', 5.6; *ἱμείρω*, 13.7; *ἐθέλω*, 13.8; *γηράσκω*, 18.1; *ἐπεφρασάμην*, 20.2; *ἐλλείποιμι*, 21.2. PLURAL: *Human* (five occurrences): *ἴομεν*, 3.1; *πεισόμεθ'*, 4c.4; *νοέομεν*, 13.33; *τερπόμεθα*, 13.36; *διαμειψόμεθα*, 15.2.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (seven occurrences): *ναίοις*, 19.2; *πείσεαι*, 20.1; *ἔξελε*, 20.1; *μέγαιρ'*, 20.2; *μεταποίησον*, 20.3; *ἄειδε*, 20.3; *ἄκουε*, 30.1. *PLURAL*: *Human* (nine occurrences): *ἠλάσατε*, 4c.2; *τίθεσθε*, 4c.3; *πεπόνθατε*, 11.1; *ἐπαμφέρετε*, 11.2; *ηὐξήσατε*, 11.3; *ἔσχετε*, 11.4; (*ὑμῖν χαῦνος νόος*) *ἔνεστι*, 11.6; *ὁρᾶτε*, 11.7; *βλέπετε*, 11.8. *God/Mythological* (two occurrences): *κλῦτε*, 13.2; *δότε*, 13.3.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (forty-two occurrences): *ὀλεῖται*, 4.1; *ἤλυθε*, 4.18; *τρύχεται*, 4.22; *ᾖι*, 4.29; *ἕποιτο*, 6.1; *ὄλλυται*, 9.3; *ἔπεσεν*, 9.4; *βαίνει*, 11.5; *κινῆι*, 12.2; *ἔχει*, 13.28; *ἐξεφάνη*, 13.28; *ἔτεισεν*, 13.29; *ἔχει*, 13.34; *ὀδύρεται*, 13.35; *πιεσθῆι*, 13.37; *ἔσται*, 13.38; *κατεφράσατο*, 13.38; *δοκεῖ*, 13.39; *δοκεῖ*, 13.42; *σπεύδει*, 13.43; *ἀλᾶται*, 13.43; *λατρεύει*, 13.48; *ξυλλέγεται*, 13.50; *ἔγνω*, 13.54; *λύσαιτ'*, 13.60; *τίθησ'*, 13.62; *οἶδεν*, 13.65; *ἔπεσεν*, 13.68; *κορέσειεν*, 13.73; *ἔχει*, 13.76; *πέλεται*, 14.1; *ἔχει*, 15.4; *πείσεται*, 22a.2; *ἔρχεται*, 24.8; *φύγοι*, 24.9; *παιδοφιλήσηι*, 25.1; *ἐκβάλλει*, 27.2; *λαχνοῦται*, 27.6; *θέλει*, 27.12; *δύναται*, 27.15; *ἵκοιτο*, 27.17; *ἔχοι*, 27.18. *God/Mythological* (twenty-four occurrences): *ἔχει*, 4.4; *σύνοιδε*, 4.15; *ἦλθ'*, 4.16; *παρέχει*, 4.31; *ἀποφαίνει*, 4.32; *ἀμφιτίθησι*, 4.33; *λειαίνει*, 4.34; *παύει*, 4.34; *ἀμαυροῖ*, 4.34; *αὑαίνει*, 4.35; *εὐθύνει*, 4.36; *πραΰνει*, 4.37; *παύει*, 4.37; *παύει*, 4.38; *ἐφορᾶι*, 13.17; *γίγνεται*, 13.26; *λέληθε*, 13.27; *ἔθηκεν*, 13.53; *φέρει*, 13.63; *δίδωσιν*, 13.69; *πέμψηι*, 13.76; *πέμποι*, 19.4; *ὀπάζοι*, 19.5; *τελέσηι*, 27.3. *Other* (forty-six occurrences): *γένοιτο*, 2.3; *ἔρχεται*, 4.17; *ἐπεγείρει*, 4.19; *ὤλεσεν*, 4.20; *ἔρχεται*, 4.26; *ὑπέρθορεν*, 4.28; *εὗρε*, 4.28; *κελεύει*, 4.30; *τίκτει*, 6.3; *ἕπηται*, 6.3; *πέλεται*, 9.1; *γίγνεται*, 9.2; *ἐστι*, 9.5; *χρή*, 9.6; *δείξει*, 10.1; *δείξει*, 10.2; *ταράσσεται*, 12.1; *ἐστί*, 12.2; *ἦλθε*, 13.8; *παραγίγνεται*, 13.9; *ἔρχεται*, 13.12; *ἕπεται*, 13.13; *ἀναμίσγεται*, 13.13; *γίγνεται*, 13.14; *τελευτᾶι*, 13.15; *διεσκέδασεν*, 13.18; *ἱκάνει*, 13.21; *ἔθηκεν*, 13.22; *λάμπει*, 13.23; *ἐστίν*, 13.24; *πέλεται*, 13.25; *κίχηι*, 13.30; *ἤλυθε*, 13.31; *ῥύσεται*, 13.56; *ἔπεστι*, 13.58; *γίγνεται*, 13.59; *κεῖται*, 13.71; *ἀναφαίνεται*, 13.75; *καθορᾶι*, 14.2; *ἐστι*, 16.1; *ἔχει*, 16.2; *κίχοι*, 20.4; *μόλοι*, 21.1; *ἐστι*, 24.1; *γίνεται*, 24.6; *καταρτύεται*, 27.11. *PLURAL*: *Human* (eighteen occurrences): *βούλονται*, 4.6; *ἐπίστανται*, 4.9; *πλουτέουσιν*, 4.11; *κλέπτουσιν*, 4.13;

ἱκνέονται, 4.24; *εἶχον*, 5.3; *ἦσαν*, 5.3; (*ἀνθρώποις νόος ἄρτιος*) *ᾖι*, 6.4; *τιμῶσιν*, 13.11; *φύγωσιν*, 13.29; *τίνουσιν*, 13.31; *(τοῖσιν) μέλει*, 13.48; *ἔχουσι*, 13.72; *σπεύδουσι*, 13.73; *πλουτέουσι*, 15.1; *πένονται*, 15.1; *πλουτέουσιν*, 24.1; *ἔχουσ'*, 27.8. *God/Mythological* (three occurrences): *δῶσι*, 13.9; *συνομαρτήσωσι*, 13.55; *ὤπασαν*, 13.74. *Other* (twelve occurrences): *φυλάσσονται*, 4.14; (*κακὰ*) *στρέφεται*, 4.23; *ἐθέλουσι*, 4.27; (*πάντα*) *ἔστι*, 4.38; (*ἄλγεα*) *κεῖται*, 4a.1; (*ταῦτ'*) *ἔσεται*, 4c.4; (*ἔργα*) *πέλει*, 13.16; (*ἔργα*) *βιᾶται*, 13.41; (*δῶρα*) *γίγνεται*, 13.64; (*ταῦτα*) *πάρεστι*, 24.3; (*ταῦτ'*) *ἀφίκηται*, 24.5; (*ἅ*) *τίθησ'*, 26.2.

Total: 180

Theognis 27-236 [4]

FIRST PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (three occurrences): *ὑποθήσομαι*, 27; *ἔμαθον*, 28; *δέδοικα*, 39. *PLURAL*: *Human* (four occurrences): *νομίζομεν*, 141; *διζήμεθα*, 183; *ἐπιστάμεθα*, 224; (*ἧμιν*) *πρέπει*, 235.

SECOND PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (fifty-three occurrences): *πέπνυσο*, 29; *ἕλκεο*, 30; *ἴσθι*, 31; *προσομίλει*, 31; *ἔχεο*, 32; *πῖνε*, 33; *ἔσθιε*, 33; *ἵζε*, 34; *ἅνδανε*, 34; *μαθήσεαι*, 35; *συμμίσγηις*, 36; *ἀπολεῖς*, 36; *ὁμίλει*, 37; *φήσεις*, 37; *ἔλπεο*, 47; *ποιεῦ*, 61; *δόκει*, 63; *συμμείξηις*, 64; *γνώσηι*, 65*;* *βούλευε*, 69; *ἐθέληις*, 70; *βούλευ*, 71; *ἀνακοινέο*, 73; *ἐπιχείρει*, 75; *λάβηις*, 76; *εὑρήσεις*, 79; *εὕροις*, 83; *στέργε*, 87; *ἔχε*, 87; *φιλεῖς*, 88; (*σοι πιστὸς νόος*) *ἔνεστι*, 88; *φίλει*, 89; *ἔχθαιρ'*, 90; *ὁρώιης*, 93; *φράζεο*, 100; *μνήσεαι*, 100; *ἀμῶις*, 107; *ἀντιλάβοις*, 108; *ἁμάρτηις*, 109; *εἰδείης*, 125; *πειρηθείης*, 126; *εἰκάσσαις*, 127; *εὔχου*, 129; *βούλεο*, 145; *πρόφερε*, 156; *εὔχου*, 171; *θαύμαζε*, 191; *ἐπίστρεφε*, 213; *ἴσχε*, 215; *ἐφέπου*, 217; *γίνου*, 217; *ἄσχαλλε*, 219; *ἔρχευ*, 220. *PLURAL*: no occurrences.

THIRD PERSON: *SINGULAR*: *Human* (fourty-three occurrences): *κύει*, 39; *τέκηι*, 39; *κεῖται*, 48*;* *ἅδοι*, 52; *ἀνέχοιτ'*, 58; *ἔχει*, 91; *ἐπαινήσηι*, 93; *ἵῆισι*, 94; *εἴπηι*, 96; *φρονῆι*, 96; *εἴη*, 97; *φέρει*, 98; *πείσηι*, 101; *ῥύσαιτο*, 103; *ἐθέλοι*, 104; *ἔχηι*, 122; *ἐργάζεται*, 135; *ἔθηκεν*, 137;

[4] Here as well as in Appendices V and VI lines 27-236 are used as a sample of the entire corpus.

ἔθηκε, 138; *ἐθέλῃσιν*, 139; *ἔλαθεν*, 144; *οἶδε*, 159; *αἰνεῖ*, 169; *δύναται*, 178; *βούλεται*, 184; *μελεδαίνει*, 185; *διδῶι*, 186; *ἀναίνεται*, 187; *βούλεται*, 188; *ἔγημε*, 189; *ἄγεται*, 194; *κτήσεται*, 200; *δοκεῖ*, 201; *ἔτεισε*, 205; *ἐπεκρέμασεν*, 206; *πίνῃι*, 212; *ἔχει*, 214; *δοκέει*, 221; *ἐστί*, 223; *ἐθέλει*, 225; *κορέσειεν*, 229; *ἔχει*, 232; *ἔμμορεν*, 234. *God/Mythological* (six occurrences): *ποίησε*, 123; *δίδωσιν*, 149; *ὤπασεν*, 151; *μέλλει*, 152; *ἐπιρρέπει*, 157; *πέμψῃι*, 232. *Other* (forty-six occurrences): *ἄγοι*, 84; *ἄγει*, 86; *ἔστ'*, 102; *ἐστίν*, 105; *ἐκκέχυται*, 110; *ἐστί*, 118; *λελήθῃι*, 121; *γένοιτο*, 130; *ἔπλεθ'*, 132; *γίνεται*, 136; *'στιν*, 147; *ἕπεται*, 150; *τίκτει*, 153; *τελεῖ*, 160; *γίνεται*, 162; *ἕπεται*, 164; *ἐστι*, 167; *καθορᾶι*, 168; *γίνεται*, 170; *δάμνησι*, 173; *χρή*, 175; *δέδεται*, 178; *χρή*, 179; *ἔμειξε*, 190; *ἐντύει*, 196; *θῆκε*, 196; *γένηται*, 197; *τελέθει*, 198; *ἔγεντο*, 202; *ὑπερέσχε*, 202; *κατέμαρψε*, 207; *ἕζετο*, 208; *ἐστιν*, 210; *προσομιλήσῃι*, 216; *ἐφάνη*, 216; *γίνεται*, 218; *ἀναφαίνεται*, 231. PLURAL: *Human* (twenty-five occurrences): *ὤλεσαν*, 43; (*τοῖσι κακοῖσιν*) *ἅδῃι*, 44; *φθείρωσι*, 45; *διδῶσιν*, 45; *ᾔδεσαν*, 54; *κατέτριβον*, 55; *ἐνέμοντο*, 56; *εἰσ'*, 57; *ἀπατῶσιν*, 59; (*σφιν πίστις οὐδεμία*) *ἔπ'* (*ἔπεστι*), 66; *ἐφίλησαν*, 67; *ἔχουσι*, 74; *τολμῶιεν*, 81; (*οἷσιν αἰδὼς*) *ἔπεστιν*, 85; *ἔχουσι*, 109; *ἐπαυρίσκουσι*, 111; *ἔχουσ'*, 112; *εἰσιν*, 115; (*ὅσοις δίκη*) *μέμηλε*, 132; *χρῶνται*, 161; *εἰσίν*, 163; *μοχθίζουσι*, 164; *τιμῶσι*, 189; *ἔχουσι*, 228; *σπεύδουσι*, 229. *God/Mythological* (three occurrences): *τελοῦσι*, 142; *τιμῶσι*, 169; *τίνονται*, 204. *Other* (seven occurrences): (*ταῦτα*) *γένηται*, 49; *ἐξαπατῶσ'*, 128; (*ἀγαθά, κακὰ*) *γίνεται*, 172; (*χρήματα*) *γίνεται*, 230; (*ὅσσ'*) *παραγίνεται*, 139; (*ὅσσ'*) *ἴσχει*, 140; (*τάδ'*) *ἀπατᾶι*, 203.

Total: 190

APPENDIX V

ELEGY

The use of diction: verbs

Archilochus

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (twelve occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *δυνησόμεθα*, 4.9; (*μοι*) *μέλει*, 5.3; (*κλαίων*) *ἰήσομαι*, 11.1; (*κάκιον*) *θήσω*, 11.2; (*οἰδαλέους πνεύμονας*) *ἔχομεν*, 13.4; *ἀναστένομεν*, 13.8. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *τλῆτε*, 13.10. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ἀγάλλεται*, 5.1; *(κακὸν) ἔχει*, 13.7; *τέρψεται*, 13.2; *πάθοι*, 14.2. *God/Mythological*: *ἀμφεπονήθη*, 9.11.

Verbs of Physical Action (thirteen occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *πίνω*, 2.2; *κάλλιπον*, 5.2; *ἐξεσάωσα*, 5.3; *κτήσομαι*, 5.4; *κρύπτομεν*, 12.1. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *ἄγε*, 4.6; *φοίτα*, 4.7; *ἄφελκε*, 4.7; *ἄγρει*, 4.8. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *μάχηται*, 15.1. *God/Mythological*: *συνάγηι*, 3.2; *ἔθεσαν*, 13.6; *δίδωσιν*, 16.1.

Callinus

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (eight occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: no occurrence. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: (*ἄλκιμον θυμὸν*) *ἕξετε*, 1.1; *αἰδεῖσθ'*, 1.2; *δοκεῖτε*, 1.3. *God/Mythological*: *ἐλέησον*, 2.1; *μνῆσαι*, 2a.1. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *στενάχει*, 1.17; *πάθηι*, 1.17; *ὁρῶσι*, 1.20.

Verbs of Physical Action (seven occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: no occurrence. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *κατάκεισθε*, 1.1. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ἀκοντισάτω*, 1.5; *ἴτω*, 1.9; *ἔρχεται*, 1.15; *ἔρδει*, 1.21; *ἔρχεται*, 5.1. *God/Mythological*: *ἐπικλώσωσ'*, 1.9.

Tyrtaeus

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (thirty-three occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *πειθώμεθα, 2.10; μνησαίμην, 12.1; (ἐν λόγωι) τιθείην, 12.1; πεισόμεθ', 19.11.* SECOND PERSON*: Human*: *(θυμὸν) ποιεῖσθε, 10.17; φιλοψυχεῖτ', 10.18; θαρσεῖτ', 11.2; δειμαίνετε, 11.3; φοβεῖσθε, 11.3; ἴστε, 11.7; ἐδάητ', 11.8; (ἐς κόρον) ἠλάσατε, 11.10.* THIRD PERSON*: Human*: *(οἷσι) μέλει, 4.4; αἰσχύνει, 10.9; ἐλέγχει, 10.9; (νέοισι πάντ') ἐπέοικεν, 10.27; τολμῶσι, 11.11; μάθηι, 11.16; διδασκέσθω, 11.27; τετλαίη, 12.11; ὀρέγοιτ', 12.12; λάθηται, 12.17; θαρσύνηι, 12.19; ὀλοφύρονται, 12.27; κέκηδε, 12.28; (ἀγλαὸν εὖχος) ἕληι, 12.36; τιμῶσιν, 12.37; μετατρέπει, 12.39; ἐθέλει, 12.40; πειράσθω, 12.44; λογήσει, 20.17. God/Mythological*: *(οὔπω Ζεὺς αὐχένα λοξὸν) ἔχει, 11.2; (οἷσι) μέλει?, 21.15.*

Verbs of Physical Action (thirty-one occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ἀφικόμεθα*, 2.15; *εἵλομεν*, 5.2; *μαχώμεθα*, 10.13; *ἀλοιησέομεν*, 19.12. SECOND PERSON*: Human: μάχεσθε*, 10.15; (*φυγῆς*) *ἄρχετε*, 10.16; *φεύγετε*, 10.20; *βάλλετε*, 11.36. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ἔνεικαν*, 4.1; *ἐμάχοντ'*, 5.4; *φεῦγον*, 5.8; *ἵκηται*, 10.7; *μενέτω*, 10.31; (*ἀσπίδ'*) *ἐχέτω*, 11.4; *ἀνύσειεν*, 11.15; *μενέτω*, 11.21; *τινασσέτω*, 11.25; *κινείτω*, 11.26; *ἐστάτω*, 11.28; *ἑλέτω*, 11.30; *μαχέσθω*, 11.33; *μένηι*, 12.16; *ἔτρεψε*, 12.21; (*κῦμα μάχης*) *ἔσχεθε*, 12.22; *ἔρχεται*, 12.38; *εἴκουσ'*, 12.42; *ἐρωήσουσιν*, 19.18; *λείψουσ'*, 23.13. *God/Mythological*: *δέδωκε*, 2.13; *ἀνέφηνε*, 4.10; *ὀλέσηι*, 12.34.

Mimnermus

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (eleven occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: (*μοι*) *μέλοι*, 1.2; *τερπόμεθα*, 2.4; *ῥέει* (*μοι ἱδρώς*), 5.1; *πτοιῶμαι*, 5.2; *πεύθομαι*, 14.2. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *τέρπε*, 7.1. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *τέρπεται*, 1.8; *τρυχοῦται*, 2.12; *ἐπιδεύεται*, 2.13; (*κακῶς*) *ἐρεῖ*, 7.2. *God/Mythological*: *ἐμέμψατο*, 14.5.

Verbs of Physical Action (nineteen occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ἀφικόμεθα*, 9.2; *ἑζόμεθ'*, 9.4; *εἵλομεν*, 9.6. SECOND PERSON: no occurences. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ἔρχεται*, 2.14; *ἐνεδέξατο*, 13a.1; *ἤϊξαν*, 13a.2; *ἴδον*, 14.2; *σεύαιθ'*, 14.7; *φέρετ'*, 14.11. *God/Mythological*: *ἔθηκε*, 1.10; *διδοῖ*, 2.16; *ἔδωκεν*, 4.1;

ἀνήγαγεν, 11.1; *ἵκοντο*, 11.4; *ᾤιχετο*, 11a.3; (*ἄμπαυσις*) *γίνεται* (*αὐτῶι*), 12.2; *εἰσαναβῆι*, 12.4; *μόληι*, 12.10; *ἐπέβη*, 12.11.

Solon

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (forty-eight occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *γινώσκω*, 4a.1; *πεισόμεθ'*, 4c.4; *ἐφρασάμην*, 5.4; (*ἀμφιβαλὼν κρατερὸν σάκος*) *ἔστην*, 5.5; *εἴασ'*, 5.6; *ἱμείρω*, 13.7; *ἐθέλω*, 13.8; *νοέομεν*, 13.33; *τερπόμεθα*, 13.36; (*τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸν πλοῦτον*) *διαμειψόμεθα*, 15.2; *ἐπεφρασάμην*, 20.2; (*ἄλγεα*) *καλλείποιμι*, 21.2. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: (*ἐς κόρον*) *ἠλάσατε*, 4c.2; (*μέγαν νόον*) *τίθεσθε*, 4c.3; *πεπόνθατε*, 11.1; *ἐπαμφέρετε*, 11.2; (*ὑμῖν χαῦνος νόος*) *ἔνεστι*, 11.6; *ὁρᾶτε*, 11.7; *βλέπετε*, 11.8; *πείσεαι*, 20.1; *μέγαιρ'*, 20.2; *ἄκουε*, 30.1. *God/Mythological*: *κλῦτε*, 13.2. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *βούλονται*, 4.6; *ἐπίστανται*, 4.9; *τρύχεται*, 4.22; (*ὁπόσοις μὴ νόος ἄρτιος*) *ἦι*, 6.4; *τιμῶσιν*, 13.11; (*ἀλιτρὸν θυμὸν*) *ἔχει*, 13.28; *ἐξεφάνη*, 13.28; (*δόξαν*) *ἔχει*, 13.34; *ὀδύρεται*, 13.35; *πιεσθῆι*, 13.37; *κατεφράσατο*, 13.38; *δοκεῖ*, 13.39; *δοκεῖ*, 13.42; (*τοῖσιν*) *μέλει*, 13.48; *ἔγνω*, 13.54; *οἶδεν*, 13.65; *κορέσειεν*, 13.73; *πείσεται*, 22a.2; *παιδοφιλήσηι*, 25.1; *θέλει*, 27.12; *δύναται*, 27.15. *God/Mythological*: *σύνοιδε*, 4.15; *ἐφορᾶι*, 13.17; (*ὀξύχολος*) *γίγνεται*, 13.26; *λέληθε*, 13.27.

Verbs of Physical Action (fifty-six occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ἦλθον*, 1.1; *ἴομεν*, 3.1; *ἔδωκα*, 5.1. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *ηὐξήσατε*, 11.3; *ναίοις*, 19.2; *ἔξελε*, 20.1; *μεταποίησον*, 20.3; *ἄειδε*, 20.3. *God/Mythological*: *δότε*, 13.3. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ὀλεῖται*, 4.1; *κλέπτουσιν*, 4.13; *ἤλυθε*, 4.18; *ἱκνέονται*, 4.24; *ἕποιτο*, 6.1; *ὄλλυται*, 9.3; *ἔπεσεν*, 9.4; *βαίνει*, 11.5; *κινῆι*, 12.2; *ἔτεισεν*, 13.29; *φύγωσιν*, 13.29; *τίνουσιν*, 13.31; *σπεύδει*, 13.43; *ἀλᾶται*, 13.43; *λατρεύει*, 13.48; *ξυλλέγεται*, 13.50; *λύσαιτ'*, 13.60; *τίθησ'*, 13.62; *ἔπεσεν*, 13.68; *σπεύδουσι*, 13.73; *ἔρχεται*, 24.8; *φύγοι*, 24.9; *ἐκβάλλει*, 27.2; *ἵκοιτο*, 27.17. *God/Mythological*: *ἔχει*, 4.4; *ἦλθ'*, 4.16; *παρέχει*, 4.31; *ἀποφαίνει*, 4.32; *ἀμφιτίθησι*, 4.33; *λειαίνει*, 4.34; *παύει*, 4.34; *ἀμαυροῖ*, 4.34; *αὐαίνει*, 4.35; *εὐθύνει*, 4.36; *πραΰνει*, 4.37; *παύει*, 4.37; *παύει*, 4.38; *δῶσι*, 13.9; *ἔθηκεν*, 13.53; *συνομαρτήσωσι*, 13.55; *φέρει*, 13.63; *δίδωσιν*, 13.69; *ὤπασαν*, 13.74; *πέμψηι*, 13.76; *πέμποι*, 19.4; *ὀπάζοι*, 19.5; *τελέσηι*, 27.3.

Theognis 27-236

Verbs of Feeling/Perception/Cognition (ninety-two occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: *Human*: *ὑποθήσομαι*, 27; *ἔμαθον*, 28; *δέδοικα*, 39; *νομίζομεν*, 141; *διζήμεθα*, 183; *ἐπιστάμεθα*, 224; (*ἧμιν*) *πρέπει*, 235. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *πέπνυσο*, 29; (*τιμὰς*) *ἕλκεο*, 30; *ἴσθι*, 31; *ἄνδανε*, 34; *μαθήσεαι*, 35; *ἔλπεο*, 47; (*φίλον*) *ποιεῦ*, 61; *δόκει*, 63; *γνώσηι*, 65; *βούλευε*, 69; *ἐθέλῃις*, 70; *βούλευ*, 71; (*ἀνίην*) *λάβῃις*, 76; *εὑρήσεις*, 79; *εὕροις*, 83; *στέργε*, 87; *ἔχε*, 87; *φιλεῖς*, 88; (*σοι νόος πιστὸς*) *ἔνεστι*, 88; *φίλει*, 89; *ἔχθαιρ'*, 90; *ὁρώιης*, 93; (*ἐνὶ θυμῶι*) *φράζεο*, 100; *μνήσεαι*, 100; *ἁμάρτῃις*, 109; *εἰδείης*, 125; *πειρηθείης*, 126; *εἰκάσσαις*, 127; *εὔχου*, 129; *βούλεο*, 145; *πρόφερε*, 156; *εὔχου*, 171; *θαύμαζε*, 191; (*ἦθος*) *ἐπίστρεφε*, 213; (*ὀργὴν*) *ἴσχε*, 215; (*τῆιδ'*) *ἐφέπου*, 217; (*ἀλλοῖος χρόα*) *γίνου*, 217; *ἄσχαλλε*, 219; (*μέσην ὁδὸν*) *ἔρχευ*, 220. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *ἅδῃι* (*τοῖσι κακοῖσιν*), 44; (*ἐν ἡσυχίηι*) *κεῖται*, 48; *ἅδοι*, 52; *ἤιδεσαν*, 54; *εἰσ'* (*ἀγαθοί*), 57; *ἀνέχοιτ'*, 58; *ἀπατῶσιν*, 59; (*σφιν πίστις οὐδεμία*) *ἔπ'* (*ἔπεστι*), 66; *ἐφίλησαν*, 67; (*νόον πιστὸν*) *ἔχουσι*, 74; *τολμῶιεν*, 81; (*οἷσιν αἰδὼς*) *ἔπεστιν*, 85; (*νόον*) *ἔχει*, 91; *ἐπαινήσηι*, 93; (*γλῶσσαν κακὴν*) *ἵηισι*, 94; *φρονῆι*, 96; (*φίλος*) *εἴη*, 97; *φέρει*, 98; *πείσηι*, 101; *ἐθέλοι*, 104; (*ἄπληστον νόον*) *ἔχουσι*, 109; *ἐπαυρίσκουσι*, 111; (*μνῆμα*) *ἔχουσ'*, 112; (*δόλιον ἦτορ*) *ἔχηι*, 122; (*ὅσοις δίκη*) *μέμηλε*, 132; *ἐθέλῃισιν*, 139; *ἔλαθεν*, 144; *οἶδε*, 159; (*δειλαῖς φρεσί*) *χρῶνται*, 161; *αἰνεῖ*, 169; *δύναται*, 178; *βούλεται*, 184; *μελεδαίνει*, 185; *ἀναίνεται*, 187; *βούλεται*, 188; *τιμῶσι*, 189; *δοκεῖ*, 201; (*ὀργὴν*) *ἔχει*, 214; *δοκέει*, 221; (*ἄφρων*) *ἐστί*, 223; *ἐθέλει*, 225; (*διπλάσιον*) *σπεύδουσι*, 229; *κορέσειεν*, 229. *God/Mythological*: *μέλλει*, 152; *τιμῶσι*, 169; *τίνονται*, 204.

Verbs of Physical Action (thirty-four occurrences)
FIRST PERSON: no occurrences. SECOND PERSON: *Human*: *προσομίλει*, 31; *πῖνε*, 33; *ἔσθιε*, 33; *ἵζε*, 34; *συμμίσγῃις*, 36; *ὁμίλει*, 37; *φήσεις*, 37; *συμμείξῃις*, 64; *ἀνακοινέο*, 73; *ἐπιχείρει*, 75. THIRD PERSON: *Human*: *τέκηι*, 39; *ὤλεσαν*, 43; *φθείρωσι*, 45; *διδῶσιν*, 45; *κατέτριβον*, 55; *ἐνέμοντο*, 56; *εἴπηι*, 96; *ἐργάζεται*, 135; *ἔθηκεν*, 137; *ἔθηκε*, 138; *μοχθίζουσι*, 164; *διδῶι*, 186; *ἔγημε*, 189; *ἄγεται*, 194; *κτήσεται*, 200; *ἔτεισε*, 205; *ἐπεκρέμασεν*, 206; *πίνῃι*, 212. *God/Mythological*: *ποίησε*, 123; *τελοῦσι*, 142; *δίδωσιν*, 149; *ὤπασεν*, 151; *ἐπιρρέπει*, 157; *πέμψηι*, 232.

APPENDIX VI

ELEGY

The use of diction: nouns

Archilochus

INTANGIBLES: (twenty occurrences)
(*Μουσέων*) *δῶρον*, 1.2; *μῶλον*, 3.2; *ἔργον*, 3.3; *ξείνια*, 6.1; *τερπωλάς*, 11.2; *θαλίας*, 11.2; *δῶρα*, 12.2; *κήδεα*, 13.1; *θαλίῃς*, 13.2; *πόλις*, 13.2; *ὀδύνῃς*, 13.4; *κακοῖσιν*, 13.5; *τλημοσύνην*, 13.6; (*κακοῖσιν*) *φάρμακον*, 13.7; *ἕλκος*, 13.8; *πένθος*, 13.10; *δήμου*, 14.1; *ἐπίρρησιν*, 14.1; *πόνος*, 17.1; *μελέτη*, 17.1.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (nineteen occurrences): *δορί*, 2.1; *μᾶζα*, 2.1; *δορί*, 2.1; *οἶνος*, 2.1; *δορί*, 2.2; *τόξα*, 3.1; *σφενδόναι*, 3.2; *ξιφέων*, 3.3; *δεῖπνον*, 4.4; *κώθωνι*, 4.6; *σέλματα*, 4.6; *νηός*, 4.6; *πώματ'*, 4.7; *κάδων*, 4.7; *οἶνον*, 4.8; *τρυγός*, 4.8; *ἀσπίδι*, 5.1; *ἀσπίς*, 5.3; *εἵμασιν*, 9.11.
Natural (nine occurrences): *πεδίωι*, 3.3; *θάμνωι*, 5.1; *ἁλός*, 8.1; *πελάγεσι*, 8.1; *κεφαλήν*, 9.10; *μέλεα*, 9.10; *κῦμα*, 13.3; *θαλάσσης*, 13.3; *πνεύμονας*, 13.5.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (three occurrences)
μάχης, 3.4; *φυλακῆι*, 4.9; *νόστον*, 8.2.

Callinus

INTANGIBLES: (fourteen occurrences)
θυμόν, 1.1; *εἰρήνηι*, 1.3; *πόλεμος*, 1.4; *θάνατος*, 1.8; (*ἄλκιμον*) *ἦτορ*, 1.10; *πολέμου*, 1.11; *θάνατον*, 1.12; *γένος*, 1.13; *μοῖρα*, 1.15; *θανάτου*, 1.15; *δήμωι*, 1.16; *λαῶι*, 1.18; *πόθος*, 1.18; *στρατός*, 5.1.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (seven occurrences): *ἔγχος*, 1.10; *ἀσπίδος*, 1.10; *δοῦπον*, 1.14; *ἀκόντων*, 1.14; *οἴκωι*, 1.15; *πύργον*, 1.20; (*Σμυρναῖοι κατέκηαν*) *μηρία*, 2a.1.
Natural (four occurrences): *γαῖαν*, 1.4; *γῆς*, 1.7; *ὀφθαλμοῖσι*, 1.20; *βοῶν*, 2a.1.

Tyrtaeus

INTANGIBLES: (one hundred and one occurrences)
γένεος, 2.11; *ἄστυ*, 2.13; *μαντείας*, 4.2; *βουλῆς*, 4.3; *πόλις*, 4.4; *ῥήτραις*, 4.6; *καλά*, 4.7; *δίκαια*, 4.7; *πόλει*, 4.8; *δήμου*, 4.9; *πλήθει*, 4.9; *νίκην*, 4.9; *κάρτος*, 4.9; *πόλει*, 4.10; *ἔτη*, 5.4; *θυμόν*, 5.5; *ἔργα*, 5.7; *ἄχθεσι*, 6.1; *δεσποσύνοισι*, 6.2; *ἀναγκαίης*, 6.2; *καρπόν*, 6.3; *μοῖρα*, 7.2; *θανάτου*, 7.2; *πατρίδι*, 10.2; *πόλιν*, 10.3; *χρησμοσύνηι*, 10.8; *πενίηι*, 10.8; *γένος*, 10.9; *εἶδος*, 10.9; *ἀτιμίη*, 10.10; *κακότης*, 10.10; *ὤρη*, 10.11; *αἰδώς*, 10.12; *γένεος*, 10.12; *θυμῶι*, 10.13; *ψυχέων*, 10.14; *φόβου*, 10.16; *φρεσί*, 10.17; *θυμόν*, 10.17; *θυμόν*, 10.24; *ἥβης*, 10.28; *γένος*, 11.1; *πληθύν*, 11.3; *ψυχήν*, 11.5; *θανάτου*, 11.5; *κῆρας*, 11.6; *ἔργ'*, 11.7; *ὀργήν*, 11.8; *πολέμου*, 11.8; *κόρον*, 11.10; *αὐτοσχεδίην*, 11.12; *λαόν*, 11.13; *ἀρετή*, 11.14; *αἰσχρά*, 11.16; *κακά*, 11.16; *πολέμωι*, 11.18; *ἔργα*, 11.27; *ἀρετῆς*, 12.2; *παλαιμοσύνης*, 12.2; *μέγεθος*, 12.3; *βίην*, 12.3; *φυήν*, 12.5; *δόξαν*, 12.9; *ἀλκῆς*, 12.9; *πολέμωι*, 12.10; *ἀρετή*, 12.13; *ἄεθλον*, 12.13; *πόληΐ*, 12.15; *δήμωι*, 12.15; *ψυχήν*, 12.18; *θυμόν*, 12.18; *πολέμωι*, 12.20; *θυμόν*, 12.23; *ἄστυ*, 12.24; *λαούς*, 12.24; *πόθωι*, 12.28; *πόλις*, 12.28; *γένος*, 12.30; *κλέος*, 12.31; *ὄνομ'*, 12.31; *κῆρα*, 12.35; *θανάτοιο*, 12.35; *εὖχος*, 12.36; *τερπνά*, 12.38; *αἰδοῦς*, 12.40; *δίκης*, 12.40; *ἀρετῆς*, 12.43; (*ἀρετῆς*) *ἄκρον*, 12.43; *θυμῶι*, 12.44; *πολέμου*, 12.44; *θυμόν*, 13.1; *ἀρετῆς*, 14.1; *θανάτου*, 14.1; (*ἀρετῆς, θανάτου*) *τέρμασιν*, 14.1; *ἔθνεσιν*, 19.3; *λοιγόν*, 19.18; *νίκης*, 20.9; *τέρμ'*, 20.10; *ἄρηα*, 20.15; *πόλις*, 21.15; *κλῆρος*, 23.5.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (fourty-eight occurrences): *ἔπεα*, 4.2; *ἄρουρα*, 6.3; *ἀσπίδ'*, 11.4; *ἀγρούς*, 10.3; *αἰχμῆι*, 11.20; *δουρός*, 11.20; *ἀσπίδος*, 11.24; *ἔγχος*, 11.25; *λόφον*, 11.26; *βελέων*, 11.28; *ἀσπίδ'*, 11.28; *ἔγχεϊ*, 11.29; *ξίφει*, 11.30; *ἀσπίδος*, 11.31; *ἀσπίδ'*, 11.31; *λόφον*, 11.32; *λόφωι*, 11.32; *κυνέην*, 11.32; *κυνέηι*, 11.32; *ξίφεος*, 11.34; *κώπην*, 11.34; *δόρυ*,

11.34; *ἀσπίδος*, 11.35; *χερμαδίοις*, 11.36; *δούρασι*, 11.37; *λόγωι*, 12.1; *ἔπεσιν*, 12.19; *φάλαγγας*, 12.21; *ἀσπίδος*, 12.25; *θώρηκος*, 12.26; *τύμβος*, 12.29; *αἰχμῆς*, 12.36; *θώκοισιν*, 12.41; *ἀσπίσι*, 19.7; *μελίας*, 19.9; *ἀσπίδας*, 19.15; *ἀσπίσι*, 19.15; *θώρηκες*, 19.17; *χερμαδίων*, 19.19; *κόρυθες*, 19.20; *ἅρμα*, 20.11; *τεῖχος*, 23.3; *τεῖχος*, 23.7; *βελέων*, 23.10; *βέλε'*, 23a.10; *αἰχμῆς*, 23a.13; *τεῖχος*, 23a.16; *τάφρος*, 23a.19.
Natural (fifty-two occurrences): *νῆσον*, 2.15; *ὀρέων*, 5.8; *ὄνοι*, 6.1; *γῆς*, 10.13; *γούνατ'*, 10.19; *κάρη*, 10.23; *γένειον*, 10.23; *κονίηι*, 10.24; *αἰδοῖα*, 10.25; *χερσί*, 10.25; *ὀφθαλμοῖς*, 10.26; *χρόα*, 10.27; *ἄνθος*, 10.28; *ποσίν*, 10.31; *γῆς*, 10.32; *χεῖλος*, 10.32; *ὀδοῦσι*, 10.32; *αὐχένα*, 11.2; *αὐγαῖς*, 11.6; *ἠελίοιο*, 11.6; *μετάφρενον*, 11.17; *νέκυς*, 11.19; *κονίηισι*, 11.19; *γῆς*, 11.22; *χεῖλος*, 11.22; *ὀδοῦσι*, 11.22; *μηρούς*, 11.23; *κνήμας*, 11.23; *στέρνα*, 11.23; *ὤμους*, 11.23; *γαστρί*, 11.24; *χειρί*, 11.25; *κεφαλῆς*, 11.26; *πόδα*, 11.31; *ποδί*, 11.31; *στέρνον*, 11.33; *στέρνωι*, 11.33; *ποδῶν*, 12.2; *γλῶσσαν*, 12.8; *κῦμα*, 12.22; *στέρνοιο*, 12.25; *γῆς*, 12.32; *γῆς*, 12.34; *χώρης*, 12.42; *λέοντος*, 13.1; *στήθεσι*, 13.1; *λίθων*, 19.2; *χερσίν*, 19.9; *στήθεσιν*, 19.17; *χαίτας*, 20.14; *κεφαλῆς*, 20.14; *ὕδωρ*, 23a.17.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (six occurrences)
φυγῆς, 10.16; *φόνον*, 12.11; *φυγῆς*, 12.17; *μάχης*, 12.22; *κτύπος*, 19.14; *καναχήν*, 19.20.

Mimnermus

INTANGIBLES: (fifty-seven occurrences)
βίος, 1.1; *τερπνόν*, 1.1; *φιλότης*, 1.3; (*μείλιχα*) *δῶρα*, 1.3; *εὐνή*, 1.3; *ἥβης*, 1.4; *γῆρας*, 1.6; *φρένας*, 1.7; *μέριμναι*, 1.7; *γῆρας*, 1.10; *ὥρη*, 2.1; *χρόνον*, 2.3; *ἥβης*, 2.3; *κακόν*, 2.4; *ἀγαθόν*, 2.5; *τέλος*, 2.6; *γήραος*, 2.6; *θανάτοιο*, 2.7; *ἥβης*, 2.7; (*ἥβης*) *καρπός*, 2.8; *τέλος*, 2.9; *ὥρης*, 2.9; *βίοτος*, 2.10; *θυμῶι*, 2.11; *κακά*, 2.11; *πενίης*, 2.12; *ἔργ'*, 2.12; *νοῦσον*, 2.15; *κακά*, 2.16; *ὥρη*, 3.1; *γῆρας*, 4.2; *θανάτου*, 4.2; *ὁμηλικίης*, 5.2; *ὄναρ*, 5.4; *ἥβη*, 5.5; *γῆρας*, 5.6; *νόον*, 5.8; *νούσων*, 6.1; *μελεδωνέων*, 6.1; *μοῖρα*, 6.2; *θανάτου*, 6.2; *φρένα*, 7.1; *ἀληθείη*, 8.1; *χρῆμα*, 8.2; *βίην*, 9.3; *ὕβριος*, 9.4; *βουλῆι*, 9.6; *ἄεθλον*, 11.3; *πόνον*, 12.1; *ἤματα*, 12.1; *μένος*, 14.1; *θυμόν*, 14.1; *μένος*, 14.6; *κραδίης*, 14.6; *πολέμοιο*, 14.7; *ἔργον*, 14.11; *γένος*, 17.1.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (sixteen occurrences): *κῶας*, 11.1; *οἶκος*, 2.11; *ἄστυ*, 9.1; *νηυσίν*, 9.2; *ὁδόν*, 11.2; *πόλιν*, 11a.1; *θαλάμωι*, 11a.2; *εὐνή*, 12.5; *χρυσοῦ*, 12.7; *ἅρμα*, 12.9; *ὀχέων*, 12.11; *μῦθον*, 13a.1; *ἀσπίσι*, 13a.2; *φάλαγγας*, 14.3; *βέλεα*, 14.8; *βάξιος*, 16.1.
Natural (thirty-two occurrences): *ἔαρος*, 2.1; *κεφαλῆς*, 5.6; *ἄνθεα*, 1.4; *αὐγάς*, 1.8; *ἠελίου*, 1.8; *φύλλα*, 2.1; *αὐγῆις*, 2.2; *ἠελίου*, 2.2; *ἄνθεσιν*, 2.3; *γῆν*, 2.8; *ἠέλιος*, 2.8; *γῆς*, 2.14; *χροιήν*, 5.1; *ἱδρώς*, 5.1; *ἄνθος*, 5.2; *ὀφθαλμούς*, 5.8; *ποταμοῖο*, 5.5; *ἀκτῖνες*, 11a.2; (*Ὠκεανοῦ*) *χεῖλος*, 11a.3; *ἵπποισιν*, 12.3; *οὐρανόν*, 12.4; *κῦμα*, 12.5; *χερσίν*, 12.6; *ἄκρον*, 12.7; *ὕδωρ*, 12.7; *χώρου*, 12.8; *γαῖαν*, 12.9; *ἵπποι*, 12.9; *πεδίον*, 14.4; *αὐγῆισιν*, 14.11; *ἠελίοιο*, 14.11; *ἵππων*, 17.1.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (four occurrences)
ῥόον, 11.4; *ἄμπαυσις*, 12.2; *ὑσμίνηι*, 14.7; *φυλόπιδος*, 14.10.

Solon

INTANGIBLES: (one hundred and seventy-three occurrences)
κόσμον, 1.2; *πατρίδ'*, 2.2; *φάτις*, 2.3; *αἶσχος*, 3.2; *πόλις*, 4.1; *αἶσαν*, 4.2; *φρένας*, 4.2; *πόλιν*, 4.5; *ἀφραδίηισιν*, 4.5; *δήμου*, 4.7; *νόος*, 4.7; *ὕβριος*, 4.8; *ἄλγεα*, 4.8; *κόρον*, 4.8; *εὐφροσύνας*, 4.10; *ἡσυχίηι*, 4.10; *ἔργμασι*, 4.11; *χρόνωι*, 4.16; *πόλει*, 4.17; *ἕλκος*, 4.17; *δουλοσύνην*, 4.18; *πόλεμον*, 4.19; *ἡλικίην*, 4.20; *ἄστυ*, 4.21; *δήμωι*, 4.23; *κακά*, 4.23; *κακόν*, 4.26; *θυμός*, 4.30; *κακά*, 4.31; *πόλει*, 4.31; *τραχέα*, 4.34; *κόρον*, 4.34; *ὕβριν*, 4.34; *ἄτης*, 4.35; *δίκας*, 4.36; *ἔργα*, 4.36; *ἔργα*, 4.37; *διχοστασίης*, 4.37; *ἔριδος*, 4.38; *χόλον*, 4.38; *φρενός*, 4a.1; *ἄλγεα*, 4a.1; *φρεσί*, 4c.1; (*καρτερὸν*) *ἦτορ*, 4c.1; *ἀγαθῶν*, 4c.2; *κόρον*, 4c.2; *μετρίοισι*, 4c.3; *νόον*, 4c.3; *δήμωι*, 5.1; *γέρας*, 5.1; *τιμῆς*, 5.2; *δύναμιν*, 5.3; *δῆμος*, 6.1; *κόρος*, 6.3; *ὕβριν*, 6.3; *ὄλβος*, 6.3; *νόος*, 6.4; *ἔργμασι*, 7.1; *πόλις*, 9.3; *δῆμος*, 9.4; *ἀϊδρίηι*, 9.4; *δουλοσύνην*, 9.4; *μανίην*, 10.1; *χρόνος*, 10.1; *ἀληθείης*, 10.2; *λυγρά*, 11.1; *κακότητα*, 11.1; *μοῖραν*, 11.2; *δουλοσύνην*, 11.4; *νόος*, 11.6; *ἔργον*, 11.8; *ὄλβον*, 13.3; *δόξαν*, 13.4; *δίκη*, 13.8; *πλοῦτον*, 13.9; *ὕβριος*, 13.11; *κόσμον*, 13.11; *ἔργμασι*, 13.12; *ἄτηι*, 13.13; *ἀρχῆς*, 13.14; *ὕβριος*, 13.16; *ἔργα*, 13.16; *τέλος*, 13.17; *ἔργα*, 13.21; *μένος*, 13.23; *τίσις*, 13.25; *θυμόν*, 13.28; *τέλος*, 13.28; *μοῖρ'*, 13.30; *ἔργα*, 13.31; *γένος*, 13.32; *δόξαν*, 13.34; *ἐλπίσι*, 13.36; *νούσοισιν*, 13.37; *μορφήν*, 13.40; *πενίης*, 13.41; *ἔργα*, 13.41; *κέρδος*, 13.44; *ψυχῆς*, 13.46; *ἐνιαυτόν*, 13.47; *ἔργα*, 13.50; *βίοτον*,

13.50; *δῶρα*, 13.51; *σοφίης*, 13.52; *μέτρον*, 13.52; *κακόν*, 13.54; *μόρσιμα*, 13.55; *ἔργον*, 13.57; *τέλος*, 13.58; *ὀδύνης*, 13.59; *ἄλγος*, 13.59; *νούσοισι*, 13.61; *κακόν*, 13.63; *ἐσθλόν*, 13.63; *δῶρα*, 13.64; *κίνδυνος*, 13.65; *ἔργμασιν*, 13.65; *χρήματος*, 13.66; *ἄτην*, 13.68; *συντυχίην*, 13.70; *ἀφροσύνης*, 13.70; *πλούτου*, 13.71; (*πλούτου*) *τέρμα*, 13.71; *βίον*, 13.72; *κέρδεα*, 13.74; *ἄτη*, 13.75; *ἀρετῆς*, 15.3; *πλοῦτον*, 15.3; *γνωμοσύνης*, 16.1; *μέτρον*, 16.2; *πείρατα*, 16.2; *νόος*, 17.1; *χρόνον*, 19.1; *γένος*, 19.2; *χάριν*, 19.5; *κῦδος*, 19.5; *νόστον*, 19.6; *πατρίδ'*, 19.6; *μοῖρα*, 20.4; *θανάτου*, 20.4; *θάνατος*, 21.1; *ἄλγεα*, 21.2; *στοναχάς*, 21.2; *ὥρη*, 24.6; *ἥβη*, 24.6; *ἄφενος*, 24.7; *θάνατον*, 24.9; *νούσους*, 24.10; *γῆρας*, 24.10; *ἥβης*, 25.1; *ἔργα*, 26.1; *εὐφροσύνας*, 26.2; *ἔτεσιν*, 27.2; *ἐνιαυτούς*, 27.3; *ἥβης*, 27.4; *σήματα*, 27.4; *ἑβδομάδι*, 27.7; *ἰσχύν*, 27.8; *πείρατ'*, 27.8; *ἀρετῆς*, 27.8; *γάμου*, 27.9; *γενεήν*, 27.10; *νόος*, 27.11; *ἔργ'*, 27.12; *νοῦν*, 27.13; *ἑβδομάσιν*, 27.13; *ἔτη*, 27.14; *ἀρετήν*, 27.16; *σοφίη*, 27.16; *μέτρον*, 27.17; *μοῖραν*, 27.18; *θανάτου*, 27.18; *ἀρχῶν*, 30.1.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:

Man-made (thirty-two occurrences): *ἐπέων*, 1.2; *ᾠδήν*, 1.2; *ἀγορῆς*, 1.2; *χρήμασι*, 4.6; *δαιτός*, 4.10; *κτεάνων*, 4.12; *θέμεθλα*, 4.14; *δεσμοῖσι*, 4.25; *θύραι*, 4.27; *ἕρκος*, 4.28; *μυχῶι*, 4.29; *θαλάμου*, 4.29; *πέδας*, 4.33; *χρήμασιν*, 5.3; *σάκος*, 5.5; *ῥύματα*, 11.3; *ἔπη*, 11.7; *χρήματα*, 13.7; *ἕδος*, 13.21; *χρήματα*, 13.42; *νηυσί*, 13.44; *ἄροτρα*, 13.48; *ἱερά*, 13.56; *φάρμακα*, 13.60; *χρήματα*, 15.4; *πόλιν*, 19.2; *νηΐ*, 19.3; *οἰκισμῶι*, 19.5; *ἄργυρος*, 24.1; *χρυσός*, 24.2; *χρήματ'*, 24.8; *ἄποινα*, 24.9.

Natural (fifty-nine occurrences): *νήσου*, 3.1; *χεῖρας*, 4.4; *γαῖαν*, 4.24; *ἄνθεα*, 4.35; *γαῖαν*, 4a.2; *νεφέλης*, 9.1; *χιόνος*, 9.1; (*χαλάζης*) *μένος*, 9.1; *χαλάζης*, 9.1; *βροντή*, 9.2; *ἀστεροπῆς*, 9.2; *μέσον*, 10.2; *ἀλώπεκος*, 11.5; *ἴχνεσι*, 11.5; *γλῶσσαν*, 11.7; *ἀνέμων*, 12.1; *θάλασσα*, 12.1; *πυθμένος*, 13.10; *κορυφήν*, 13.10; *πυρός*, 13.14; *ἄνεμος*, 13.18; *νεφέλας*, 13.18; *πόντου*, 13.19; *πυθμένα*, 13.20; *γῆν*, 13.20; *οὐρανόν*, 13.22; *αἰθρίην*, 13.22; *ἠελίοιο*, 13.23; *γαῖαν*, 13.23; *νεφέων*, 13.24; *πόντον*, 13.43; *ἀνέμοισι*, 13.45; *γῆν*, 13.47; *χειροῖν*, 13.50; *οἰωνός*, 13.56; *χειροῖν*, 13.62; *ἠέλιος*, 14.2; *νήσου*, 19.3; *ἵπποι*, 23.1; *κύνες*, 23.2; *γῆς*, 24.2; *πεδία*, 24.2; *ἵπποι*, 24.3; *ἡμίονοι*, 24.3; *γαστρί*, 24.4; *πλευραῖς*, 24.4; *ποσίν*, 24.4; *ἄνθεσι*, 25.1; *μηρῶν*, 25.2; *στόματος*, 25.2; *ἕρκος*, 27.1; *ὀδόντων*, 27.1; *γένειον*, 27.5; *γυίων*, 27.5; *χροιῆς*, 27.6; *ἄνθος*, 27.6; *γλῶσσαν*, 27.13; *γλῶσσα*, 27.16; *ἀκτῆς*, 28.1.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (five occurrences)
ἀφαρπαγῆι, 4.13; *στάσιν*, 4.19; *συνόδοις*, 4.22; *ἔκλυσιν*, 13.70; *προχοῆισι*, 28.1.

Theognis 27-236

INTANGIBLES: (one hundred and sixty-seven occurrences)
ἔργμασι, 29; *τιμάς*, 30; *ἄφενος*, 30; *δύναμις*, 34; *ἐσθλά*, 35; *νόον*, 36; *πόλις*, 39; *ὕβριος*, 40; *κακότητα*, 42; *πόλιν*, 43; *δίκας*, 45; *κερδέων*, 46; *κράτεος*, 46; *πόλιν*, 47; *ἡσυχίηι*, 48; *κέρδεα*, 50; *κακῶι*, 50; *πόλει*, 52; *πόλις*, 53; *λαοί*, 53; *δῆμον*, 45; *δίκας*, 54; *νόμους*, 54; *πόλεος*, 56; *γνώμας*, 60; *θυμοῦ*, 62; *χρείης*, 62; *χρῆμα*, 64; *φρένας*, 65; *ἔργοισιν*, 66; *πίστις*, 66; *δόλους*, 67; *ἀπάτας*, 67; *πολυπλοκίας*, 67; *πρῆγμ'*, 70; *πρῆξιν*, 73; *νόον*, 74; *ἔργ'*, 75; *ἀνίην*, 76; *διχοστασίηι*, 78; *πρήγμασι*, 80; *θυμόν*, 81; *ἀγαθῶν*, 82; *κακῶν*, 82; *αἰδώς*, 86; *χρῆμ'*, 86; *κέρδος*, 86; *νόον*, 87; *φρένας*, 87; *νόος*, 88; *νόον*, 89; *νεῖκος*, 90; *νόον*, 91; *χρόνον*, 93; *λεῖα*, 96; *ὀργήν*, 98; *θυμῶι*, 99; *ὄφελος*, 102, *πόνου*, 103; *ἄτης*, 103; *ἐσθλόν*, 104; *χάρις*, 105; *νόον*, 109; *φιλότης*, 110; *χάριν*, 112; *πρήγματι*, 116; *εὐλαβίης*, 118; *ἄτη*, 119; *νόος*, 121; *φρεσίν*, 122; *ἦτορ*, 122; *νόον*, 125; *γνώμην*, 128; *ἰδέαι*, 128; *ἀρετήν*, 129; *ἄφενος*, 130; *τύχη*, 130; *δίκη*, 132; *ἄτης*, 133; *κέρδεος*, 133; *φρεσίν*, 135; *τέλος*, 136; *ἀγαθόν*, 136; *κακόν*, 136; *κακόν*, 137; *ἐσθλόν*, 137; *ἐσθλόν*, 138; *κακόν*, 138; *πείρατ'*, 140; *ἀμηχανίης*, 140; *νόον*, 142; *δικαιοσύνηι*, 147; *ἀρετή*, 147; *ἀρετῆς*, 150; *μοῖρ'*, 150; *ὕβριν*, 151; *χώρην*, 152; *κόρος*, 153; *ὕβριν*, 153; *ὄλβος*, 153; *νόος*, 154; *πενίην*, 155; *ἀχρημοσύνην*, 156; *φρεσί*, 161; *κακόν*, 162; *ἀγαθόν*, 162; *βουλῆι*, 163; *τέλος*, 164; *ἔργμασιν*, 164; *κακόν*, 167; *ἀτρεκές*, 167; *σπουδή*, 170; *κράτος*, 171; *ἀγάθ'*, 172; *κακά*, 172; *πενίη*, 173; *γήρως*, 174; *πενίηι*, 177; *γλῶσσα*, 178; *πενίης*, 180; *πενίηι*, 182; *ἀφνεόν*, 188; *πλοῦτος*, 190; *γένος*, 190; *γένος*, 191; *ἐσθλά*, 192; *κακοῖς*, 192; *ἀνάγκη*, 195; *νόον*, 196; *χρῆμα*, 197; *δίκηι*, 197; *καιρόν*, 199; *θυμῶι*, 199; *ὅρκωι*, 200; *δίκαιον*, 200; *κέρδος*, 201; *τελευτήν*, 201; *κακόν*, 202; *νόος*, 202; *νόον*, 203; *πρήγματος*, 204; *ἀμπλακίας*, 204; *χρέος*, 205; *ἄτην*, 206; *δίκη*, 207; *θάνατος*, 207; *κῆρα*, 208; *κακόν*, 211; *θυμέ*, 213; *ἦθος*, 213; *ὀργήν*, 214; *ὀργήν*, 215; *σοφίη*, 218; *ἀτροπίης*, 218; *δήνεα*, 222; *νόου*, 223; *ποικίλ'*, 224; *κακοκερδείηισιν*, 225; *δολοπλοκίαι*, 226; *πλούτου*, 227; *τέρμα*, 227; *βίον*, 228; *ἀφροσύνη*, 230; *ἄτη*, 231; *δήμωι*, 233; *τιμῆς*, 234; *πόλει*, 236.

TANGIBLES/PERCEPTIBLES:
Man-made (twenty-six occurrences): *δορᾶς*, 55; *ὁδόν*, 72; *χρυσοῦ*, 77; *ἀργύρου*, 77; *ναῦς*, 84; *ἔπεσιν*, 87; *λήιον*, 107; *μνῆμα*, 112; *πόσιος*, 115; *βρώσιος*, 115; *χρυσοῦ*, 119; *ἀργύρου*, 119; *χρήμασιν*, 145; *χρήματα*, 146; *χρήματα*, 149; *τάλαντον*, 157; *ἔπος*, 159; *χρήματα*, 186; *χρήματα*, 189; *οἴκους*, 194; *χρήμασι*, 194; *οἶνον*, 211; *ὁδόν*, 220; *χρήματα*, 230; *ἀκρόπολις*, 233; *πύργος*, 233.
Natural (thirty-two occurrences): *πλευραῖς*, 55; *αἰγῶν*, 55; *ἔλαφοι*, 56; *γλώσσης*, 63; *ποσσίν*, 72; *γλώσσηι*, 85; *ὀφθαλμοῖσιν*, 85; *γλώσσηι*, 91; *γλῶσσαν*, 94; *γλώσσηι*, 96; *πόντον*, 106; *ἁλός*, 106; *πόντον*, 107; *λιμένα*, 114; *στήθεσι*, 121; *ὑποζυγίου*, 126; *νύξ*, 160; *ἡμέρη*, 160; *ἠέλιος*, 168; *ἠπιάλου*, 174; *πόντον*, 175; *πετρέων*, 176; *γῆν*, 179; *νῶτα*, 179; *θαλάσσης*, 179; *κριούς*, 183; *ὄνους*, 183; *ἵππους*, 183; *βλεφάροις*, 208; *πουλύπου*, 215; *πέτρηι*, 215; *χρόα*, 217.

PHYSICAL ACTION: (four occurrences)
στάσιες, 51; *φόνοι*, 51; *λύσιν*, 180; *φυγῆς*, 210.

WORKS CITED

Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeideia: The* Iambi *of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.

Adkins, A. 1969. "Threatening, Abusing, and Feeling Angry in the Homeric Poems." *JHS* 89: 7-21.

Adrados, F. R. 1975. *Festival, Comedy and Tragedy*. Leiden.

——. 1999. *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable*. Vol. 1. Leiden.

Allen, A. 1993. *The Fragments of Mimnermus*. Stuttgart.

Almeida, J. 2003. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems*. Leiden and Boston.

Aloni, A. 1981. *Le Muse di Archiloco*. Copenhagen.

——. 2001. "What is That Man Doing in Sappho, fr. 31 V.?" In A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi, eds., *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham. 29-40.

Anhalt, E. 1993. *Solon the Singer. Politics and Poetics.* Lanham, Md.

Andrisano, A. M. 2001. "Iambic Motifs in Alcaeus' Lyrics." In A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi, eds., *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham. 41-63.

Arnould, D. 1980. "Archiloque et le Vin d'Ismaros (fr. 2 Diehl = 2 West = 7 Lasserre-Bonnard)." *RPhl* 54: 284-94.

——. 1989. "Le chauve et le glouton chez Homère: Remarques sur le personage d'Ulysse." *REG* 102: 510-14.

Barker, A. 1984. *Greek Musical Writings*. Vol. 1. Cambridge.

Barron, J. P. and P. E. Easterling. 1985. "The Cyclic Poets." In P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 1. Cambridge. 106-10.

——. 1985. "Archilochus." In P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox, eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 1. Cambridge. 117-28.

Bartol, K. 1992. "Where was Iambic Poetry Performed? Some Evidence from the Fourth Century BC." *CQ* 42: 65-71.

——. 1993. *Greek Elegy and Iambus: Studies in Ancient Literary Sources*. Poznań.

Blaise, F. 1995. "Solon Fragment 36 W. Pratique et fondation des normes politiques." *REG* 108: 24-37.

Blundell, M. 1989. *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics*. Cambridge.

Bonanno, M. G. 1980. "Nomi e soprannomi archilochei." *MH* 37: 65-88.

Bossi, F. 1981. "Appunti per un profilo di Archiloco." *QS* 13: 117-42.

Bowie, E. L. 1986. "Early Greek Elegy, Symposium and Public Festival." *JHS* 106: 13-35.

——. 1987. "One that got away: Archilochus 188-192 W and Horace Odes 1.4 & 5." In L. M. Whitby, P. R. Hardie, and J. M. Whitby, eds., *Homo Viator: Classical essays for John Bramble*. Bristol. 13-23.

——. 1990. "*Miles Ludens*? The Problem of Martial Exhortation in Early Greek Elegy." In O. Murray, ed., *Sympotica*. Oxford. 221-9.

——. 1993. "Lies, Fiction and Slander in Early Greek Poetry." In C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman, eds., *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Austin. 1-37.
——. 2001. "Early Greek Iambic Poetry: The Importance of Narrative." In A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi, eds., *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham. 1-27.
——. 2002. "Ionian Iambos and Attic Komoidia: Father and Daughter or just Cousins?" In A. Willi, ed., *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford. 33-50.
Bowra, M. C. 1938. *Early Greek Elegists*. Cambridge.
——. 1954. "A Couplet of Archilochus." *AFC* 6: 37-43.
Broadhead, H. D. 1960. *The Persae of Aeschylus*. Cambridge.
Brown, C. 1988. "Hipponax and Iambe." *Hermes* 116: 478-81.
——. 1989. "Ares, Aphrodite, and the Laughter of the Gods." *Phoenix* 43: 283-93.
——. 1995. "The Parched Furrow and the Loss of Youth: Archilochus fr. 188 West 2." *QUCC* 50: 29-34.
——. 1997. "Iambos." In D. E. Gerber, ed., *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Leiden. 13-88.
——. 2001. "Arrows and Etymology: Gaetulicus' Epitaph for Archilochus." *CP* 96: 429-432.
Burnett, A. P. 1983. *Three Archaic Poets*. Cambridge, MA.
——. 1987. Review of *Poetry into Drama*, by C. Herington. *CP* 82: 154-56.
Cairns, F. 1972. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Edinburgh.
Calame, C. 1974. "Réflexions sur les genres littéraires en Grèce archaïque." *QUCC* 17: 113-28.
——. 1977. *Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*. Rome.
Campbell, D. A. 1967. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. London.
Carey, C. 1986. "Archilochus and Lycambes." *CQ* 36: 60-67.
Carrière, J. C. 1979. *Le carnival et la politique. Une introduction à la comédie grecque*. Paris.
Carson, A. 1984. "How Bad a Poem is Semonides Fragment 1?" In D. E. Gerber, ed., *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. Chico, CA. 59-71.
Ceccareli, P. 1996. "L'Athènes de Périclès: un «pays de cocagne»?: l'idéologie démocratique et l' *αὐτόματος βίος* dans la comédie ancienne." *QUCC* n.s. 54: 109-159.
Clay, D. 2001. "The Scandal of Dionysos on Paros. (The Mnesiepes Inscription E1 III)." *Prometheus* 27: 97-112.
Clay, J. 1986. "Archilochus and Gyges: An Interpretation of Fr. 23 West." *QUCC* n.s 24: 7-17.
Cobb-Stevens, V. 1985. "Opposites, Reversals, and Ambiguities: The Unsettled World of Theognis." In T. J. Figuera and G. Nagy, eds., *Theognis of Megara*. Baltimore. 159-75.
Connor, W. R. 1989. "City Dionysia and Athenian Democracy." *C & M*: 40: 7-23.
Conte, G. 1994. *Genres and Readers*. Baltimore and London.
Cunningham, I. 1971. *The Mimiamboi of Herodas*. Oxford.
Dalby, A. 1996. *Siren Feasts: A History of Food and Gastronomy in Greece*. London and New York.
Davies, M. 1985. "Conventional topics of invective in Alcaeus." *Prometheus* 9: 31-9.
——. 1988. "Monody, Choral Lyric, and the Tyranny of the Hand-book." *CQ* 38: 52-64.
Davison, J. A. 1960. "Archilochus Fr. 2 Diehl." *CR* 10: 1-4.
Day, J. W. 1985. Review of *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculorum VIII-V a. Chr. n*. *AJP* 106: 374-6.

——. 2000. “Epigram and Reader: Generic Force as (Re-)Activation of Ritual.” In M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds., *Matrices of Genre*. Cambridge, MA. 37-57.
Degani, E. 1980. Review of M. West’s *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. *Gnomon* 52: 512-16.
——. 1984. *Studi su Ipponatte*. Bari.
——. 1993. “Aristofane e la tradizione dell’ invettiva personale in Grecia.” In J. M. Bremer and E. W. Handley, eds., *Aristophane* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 38). Geneva. 1-49.
Della Corte, F. 1940. “Elegia e Giambo in Archiloco.” *RFIC* 68: 90-98.
Depew, M. 1992. “*ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν*: Genre, Occasion, and Imitation in Callimachus, frr. 191 and 203 Pf.” *TAPA* 122: 313-30.
Depew M. and D. Obbink. 2000. “Introduction.” In M. Depew and D. Obbink, eds., *Matrices of Genre*. Cambridge, MA. 1-14.
Dobson, N. 2003. *Iambic Elements in Archaic Greek Epic*. Dissertation. University of Texas at Austin.
Donlan, W. 1985. “*Pistos Philos Hetairos*.” In T. J. Figueira and G. Nagy, eds., *Theognis of Megara*. Baltimore and London. 223-44.
Dougherty, C. 1994. “Archaic Greek Foundation Poetry: Questions of Genre and Occasion.” *JHS* 114: 35-46.
Dover, K. J. 1963. “The poetry of Archilochus.” *Archiloque* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 10). Geneva. 183-212.
Drew-Bear, T. 1968. “The Trochaic Tetrameter in Greek Tragedy.” *AJP* 89: 385-405.
Duplouy, A. 1999. “L’utilisation de la figure de Crésus dans l’idéologie aristocratique athénienne. Solon, Alcméon, Miltiade et le dernier roi de Lydie.” *AC* 68: 1-22.
Edmonds, J. M. 1931. *Elegy and Iambus*. Vol. 2. London 1931.
Edmunds, E. 1985. “The Genre of Theognidean Poetry.” In T. J. Figuera and G. Nagy, eds., *Theognis of Megara*. Baltimore. 96-111.
Else, G. W. 1965. *The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge, MA.
Ehrenberg, V. 1962. “Archilochus, Fragm. 2 D.” *CP* 57: 239-40.
Ford, A. 1993. “L’inventeur de la poésie lyrique Archiloque le colon.” *Métis* 8: 59-73.
Fordyce, C. J. 1961. *Catullus: A Commentary*. Oxford.
Fowler, R. L. 1987. *The Nature of Early Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*. Toronto.
Fraenkel, E. 1950. *Agamemnon*. Oxford.
Fränkel, H. 1975. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. Translated by M. Hadas and J.Willis. Oxford.
Fraser, P. M. and E. Matthews. 1987. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Vol. 1. Oxford.
Gentili, B. 1965a. “Interpretazione di Archiloco fr. 2 D = 7 L-B.” *RFIC* 93: 129-34.
——. 1965b. “Mimnermo. Interventi di F. Della Corte, V. De Marco, A. Garzya, A. Colonna, L. Alfonsi, B. Gentili.” *Maia* 17: 366-87.
——. 1988. *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore and London.
Gerber, D. E. 1970. *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry*. Amsterdam.
——. 1976. “Archilochus, Fr. 42 West.” *QUCC* 22: 7-14.
——. 1981. “Archilochus, Fr. 4 West: A Commentary.” *ICS* 6: 1-11.
——. 1984. “Semonides, Fragment 1 West: A Commentary.” In D. E. Gerber, ed., *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. Chico, CA. 125-35.
——. 1999. *Greek Iambic Poetry*. Cambridge, MA.
Giangrande, G. 1967. “Sympotic Literature and Epigram.” In *L’Epigramme Grecque* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 14). Geneva. 91-174.
——. 1972. “Archiloque au Pilori.” *QUCC* 14: 37-40.

Golden, M. 1982. "*Pais* in Hippo. Fr. 13W." *QUCC* n.s. 12: 73-5.

Griffiths, A. 1995. "Non-Aristocraric Elements in Archaic Poetry." In A. Powell, ed., *The Greek World*. London and New York. 85-103.

Halliwell, S. 1991. "Laughter in Greek Culture." *CQ* n.s. 41: 279-96.

Hansen, P. A. 1983. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculorum VIII-V a. Chr. n***.** (CEG1).Berlin.

——. 1989. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculi IV a. Chr. n.* (CEG2). Berlin.

Harris, W. 2001. *Restraining Rage: the Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA.

Harvey, A. E. 1955. "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry." *CQ* 49: 157-75.

Hawkins, T. 2003. *Cursing, Control, and Christianity: the Iambikê Idea in Late Antiquity.* Dissertation. Stanford University.

Hays, G. 1994. "Exorcising Hipponax: petitioners and beggars in Greek poetry." *Lexis* 12: 11-26.

Henderson, J. 1975. *The Maculate Muse*. New York and Oxford.

Henry, W. B. 1998. "An Archilochus Papyrus?" *ZPE* 121: 94.

Herington, J. 1985. *Poetry into Drama*. Berkeley.

Hordern, J. 2002. "Semonides, fr. 7.41-2." *CQ* 52: 581-2.

Hubbard, T. 1994. "Elemental Psychology and the date of Semonides of Amorgos." *AJP* 115: 175-97.

——. 1996. "New Simonides or Old Semonides?" *Arethusa* 29: 255-62.

Hughes, B. B. 1996. "Callimachus, Hipponax, and the persona of the iambographer." *MD* 37: 205-16.

Irwin, E. 1998. "Biography, fiction, and the Archilochean *ainos*." *JHS* 118: 177-83.

——. 1999. "Different entries, same story: Solon's colony and the evolution of solecism." *BICS* 43: 187-93.

Janko, R. 1980. "Aeschylus' *Oresteia* and Archilochus." *CQ* 30: 291-3.

Kantzios, I. 2005. "Tyranny and the Symposion of Anacreon." *CJ* 100: 227-45.

Käppel, L. 1992. *Paian*. Berlin and New York.

Kerkhecker, A. 1999. *Callimachus' Book of Iambi.* Oxford.

Kirkwood, G. M. 1974. *Early Greek Monody*. Ithaca and London.

Knox, A. D. 1923. *The First Greek Anthologist, with Notes on Some Choliambic Fragments*. Cambridge.

Koster, S. 1980. *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*. Meisenheim am Glan.

Kurke, L. 1999. *Coins, Bodies, Games, and Gold.* Princeton.

Lasserre, F. and A. Bonnard. 1958. *Archiloque: Fragments*. Paris.

Lasserre, F. 1979. "Iambische Dichtung und antike Theorien ueber den Iambos bis Aristoteles." *Acta Philologica Aenipontana* 4: 59-61.

——. 1984. "La fable en Grèce dans la poésie archaïque." In F. R. Adrados, ed., *La Fable* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 30). Geneva. 61-96.

Latacz, J. 1977. *Kampfparanese, Kampfdarstellung und Kampfwirklichkeit in der Ilias, bei Kallinos und Tyrtaios*. Munich.

Lattimore, R. 1944. "Notes on Greek Poetry." *AJP* 65: 172-5.

Latte, K. 1964. "Zeitgeschichtliches zu Archilochos." *Hermes* 92: 385-90.

Lavelle, B. M. 1997. "*Epikouros* and *Epikouroi* in Early Greek Literature." *GRBS* 38: 229-262.

——. 2002. "The Apollodoran Date for Archilochus." *CP* 97: 344-350.

Lefkowitz, M. 1976. "Fictions in Literary Biography: the New Poem and the Archilochus Legend." *Arethusa* 9: 181-9.

——. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets.* Baltimore.

Lennartz, K. 2000a. “Zu Archilochos Fragment 19 (West).” *MH* 57: 1-9.
——. 2000b. “Zum ‘erweiterten’ Jambusbegriff.” *RhM* 143: 225-50.
Lévêque, P. 1997. “Hipponactea ou de quelques esclaves d’Ėphèse.” In P. Brulé and J.Qulhen, eds., *Esclavage, guerre, économie en Grèce ancienne: homage à Yvon Garlan.* Place. 19-24.
Lloyd Jones, H. 1975. *Females of the Species. Semonides on Women.* London.
Loeffler, A. 1993. “La valeur argumentative de la perspective énonciative dans Solon fr. 1 G.-P.” *QUCC* 45: 23-36.
Löffler, D. 1999. “Zu Hipponax Fragment 78.14 Degani (78.14 West).” *Prometheus* 25: 35-6.
Loraux, N. 1993. *The Children of Athena*, translated by C. Levine. Princeton.
Lucas, D. W. 1967. Review of G. Else’s *The Origin and Early Form of Greek Tragedy*. *CR* 17: 70-2.
Maehler, H., M. Noussia, and M. Fantuzzi. 2001. *Solone: Frammenti dell’ opera poetica*. Milan.
Masaracchia, A. 1958. *Solone*. Florence.
Masson, O. 1962. *Les Fragments du Poète Hipponax*. Paris.
Melissano, P. 1994. “Solone e il mondo degli *ἐσθλοί*.” *QUCC* 47: 49-58.
Michelini, A. N. 1982. *Tradition and Dramatic Form in the* Persians *of Aeschylus*. Leiden.
Miralles, C. and J. Portulas. 1983. *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*. Rome.
Most, G. W. 2000. “Generating Genres: The Idea of the Tragic.” In M. Depew and D.Obbink, eds., *Matrices of Genre*. Cambridge, MA. 15-35.
Mülke, C. 2002. *Solons politische Elegien und Iamben (Fr. 1-13; 32-37 West): Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Munich-Leipzig.
Müller, C. W. 1985. “Die Archilochoslegende.” *RhM* 128: 99-151.
Murray, O. 1980. *Early Greece*. Stanford.
——. 1982. “Symposia and Männerbund.” In P. Oliva and A. Frolikova, eds., *Concilium Eirene* xvi/l. Prague.
——. 1990. “Sympotic History.” In O. Murray, ed., *Sympotica*. Oxford. 3-13.
Murray, P. 1996. *Plato on Poetry*. Cambridge.
Nagy, G. 1976. “*Iambos*. Typologies of Invective and Praise.” *Arethusa* 9: 191-205.
——. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Baltimore.
——. 1990. *Pindar’s Homer*. Baltimore and London.
——. 1994/5. “Genre and Occasion.” *Métis* 9/10: 11-25.
Newman, J. 1998. “Iambe/Iambos and the Rape of a Genre: a Horatian Sidelight.” *ICS*: 101-20.
Notopoulos, J. 1966. “Archilochus the Aoidos.” *TAPA* 97: 311-5.
Noussia, M. 2001. “Solon's Symposium (Frs. 32-4 and 36 Gentili-Prato [2] = 38-40 and 41 West [2]).” *CQ* 51: 353-359.
Osborne, R. 2001. “The Use of Abuse: Sem. 7.” *PCPS* 47: 47-64.
Page, D. L. 1936. “The Elegiacs in Euripides’ *Andromache*.” In *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays Presented to G. Murray*. Freeport, N. Y. 206-30.
——. 1963. “Archilochus and the Oral Tradition.” *Archiloque* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 10). Geneva. 117-64.
——. 1981. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge.
Parker, V. 1998. “Tyrannos. The Semantics of a Political Concept from Archilochus to Aristotle.” *Hermes* 126: 145-172.
Parks, W. 1990. *Verbal Dueling in Heroic Narrative*. Princeton.
Pavese, C. O. 1972. *Tradizioni e Generi Poetici della Grecia Arcaica*. Rome.

Pellizer, E. 1981. “Per una morfologia della poesia giambica arcaica.” In G. Petronio, ed., *I Canoni Letterari, Storia e Dinamica.* Trieste. 35-48.

——. 1983a. “Della zuffa simpotica.” In M. Vetta, ed., *Poesia e Simposio nella Grecia Antica: Guida Storice e Critica.* Rome and Bari. 31-41.

——. 1983b. “Sulla cronologia, la vita e l’opere di Semonide Amorgino.” *QUCC* n.s. 14: 17-28.

——. 1990. “Outlines of a Morphology of Sympotic Entertainment.” In O. Murray, ed., *Sympotica.* Oxford. 177-84.

Pellizer E. and Tedeschi G. 1990. *Semonide.* Rome.

Picard-Cambridge, A. W. 1927. *The Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy.* Oxford.

Podlecki, A. J. 1984. *The Early Greek Poets and their Times.* Vancouver.

Pomeroy, S. B. 1975. *Goddesses, Wives, Whores and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity.* New York.

Puppini, P. 1986. “Espressione mimiche a simposio.” *QFC* 5: 39-52.

Quinn, K. 1973. Review of F. Cairns’ *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry. Phoenix* 27: 403-7.

Raalte, van, M. 1986. *Rhythm and Metre. Towards a Systematic Description of Greek Stichic Verse.* Assen.

Rankin, H. D. 1974. “Archilochus Was no Magician.” *Eos* 62: 5-21.

——. 1975. “*μοιχός, λάγνος καὶ ὑβριστής.* Critias and his Judgement of Archilochus.” *GB* 3: 323-34.

——. 1977. *Archilochus of Paros.* Park Ridge, IL.

——. 1978. “The New Archilochus and Some Archilochean Questions.” *QUCC* 28: 7-27.

Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigram und Skolion.* Giessen.

Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter.* Oxford.

Rosen, R. M. 1987. “Hipponax Fr. 48 DG. and the Eleusinian Kykeon.” *AJP* 108: 416-26.

——. 1988a. “A Poetic Initiation Scene in Hipponax?” *AJP* 109: 174-9.

——. 1988b. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition.* Atlanta.

——. 1988c. “Hipponax, Boupalos, and the Conventions of the Psogos.” *TAPA* 118: 29-41.

——. 1990. “Hipponax and the Homeric Odysseus.” *Eikasmos* 1: 11-25.

——. 2003. “The Death of Thersites and the Sympotic Performance of Iambic Mockery.” *Pallas* 61: 121-136.

Rösler, W. 1976. “Die Dichtung des Archilochos und die Kölner Epode.” *RhM* 119: 289-310.

——. 1985. “Persona reale o persona poetica? L’interpretazione dell’ ‘io’ nella lirica greca arcaica.” *QUCC* n.s. 19: 131-44.

——. 1993. “Über Aischrologie im archaischen und klassischen Griechenland.” In S. Döpp, ed., *Karnevaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken kulturen und Literaturen.* Trier. 75-97.

Rossi, L. E. 1971. “I generi letterari e le loro leggi Scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche.” *BICS* 18: 69-94.

Rossi, L. E. 1983. “Il simposio greco arcaico e classico come spettacolo a se stesso.” In *Spettacoli conviviali dall’antichità classica alle corti italiane del’ 400. Atti dei VII Convegnodi Studio.* Viterbo. 41-50.

Russo, J. 1974. “The Inner Man in Archilochus and the Odyssey.” *GRBS* 15: 139-52.

Rusten, J. 1977. “Wasps 1360-69. Philokleon’s *τωθασμός.*” *HSCP* 81: 157-61.

Schear, L. 1984. “Semonides Fr. 7: Wives and their Husbands.” *EMC* 3: 39-49.

Schmitt-Pantel, P. 1990. "Sacrificial Meal and Symposion: Two Models of Civic Institutions in Archaic City?" In O. Murray, ed., *Sympotica*. Oxford. 14-33.
Schwartz, G. 1975. "The *Kopros* Motif: Variations of a Theme in the *Odyssey*." *RSC* 23: 177-95.
Seaford R. 1977. "The Hyporchema of Pratinas." *Maia* 29: 81-94.
Seidensticker, B. 1978. "Archilochus and Odysseus." *GRBS* 19: 5-22.
Slings, S. R. 1982. "Archilochus and the Ant." *ZPE* 45: 69-70.
——. 1983. "Once More Archilochus and the Ant." *ZPE* 53: 31-6.
——. 1987. "Archilochus." In J. M. Bremer, A. Maria van Erp Taalman Kip, and S. R. Slings. *Some Recently Found Greek Poems*. Leiden. 1-61.
——. 1990. "The I in Personal Archaic Lyric." In S. R. Slings, ed., *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric*. Amsterdam. 1-30.
——. 1995. "Archilochus, fr. 188, 1-2." *ZPE* 106: 1-2.
Stehle, E. 1997. *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece*. Princeton.
Tedeschi, G. 1978. "L' elegia parenetica-guerriera e il simposio: A proposito del fr. 1 W. di Callino." *RSC* 26: 203-9.
——. 1981. "I prestiti linguistici nei frammenti ipponattei e il problema dell' interferenza culturale ad Efeso." *QFC* 3: 35-48.
——. 1982: "Solone e lo spazio della communicazione elegiaca." *QUCC* 39: 33-46.
Thalmann, W. G. 1988. "Thersites: Comedy, Scapegoats, and Heroic Ideology in the *Iliad*." *TAPA* 118: 1-28.
Toohey, P. 1988. "Archilochus' General (Fr. 114W): Where Did He Come From?" *Eranos* 86: 1-14.
Treu, M. 1959. *Archilochus*. Munich.
Tucker, J. 1987. *Ritual Insults for Gluttony and Laziness in Greek Poetic Initiations: Theogony 26 and its Echoes*. Dissertation. University of Michigan.
Van Dijk, G-L. 1997. *AINOI, ΛΟΓΟΙ, ΜΥΘΟΙ: Fables in Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greek Literature*. Leiden.
Van Sickle, J. 1975. "The New Erotic Fragment of Archilochus." *QUCC* 20: 123-55.
Wallace, M. B. 1970. "Notes on Early Greek Grave Epigrams." *Phoenix* 24: 95-105.
——. 1984. "The Metres of Early Greek Epigrams." In D. E. Gerber, ed., *Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. Chico, CA. 303-17.
West, M. L. 1964. "The Muses buy a cow." *CR* 14: 141-2.
——. 1970. "Archilochus and Tyrtaeus" *CR* 20: 147-51.
——. 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.
——. 1979. "The Parodos of the *Agamemnon*." *CQ* 29: 1-6.
——. 1984. "The Ascription of Fables to Aesop in Archaic and Classical Greece." In F. R. Adrados, ed., *La Fable* (Entretiens de la Fondation Hardt 30). Geneva. 105-28.
——. 1992. *Ancient Greek Music*. Oxford.
——. 1994. "Some Oriental Motifs in Archilochus." *ZPE* 102: 1-5.
——. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford.
——. 1998. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci, Editio Altera*. Oxford.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin.
Will, F. 1966. *Archilochus*. New York.
Willi, A. 2002. "The Language of Greek Comedy: Introduction and Bibliographical Sketch." In A. Willi, ed., *The Language of Greek Comedy*. Oxford. 1-32.
Worman, N. 2002. *The Cast of Character: Style in Greek Literature*. Austin.
Yerly, C. 1992. "Figures du tyran archaïque." *EL* 2: 3-32.

Zanetto, G. 2001. “Iambic Patterns in Aristophanic Comedy.” In A. Cavarzere, A. Aloni, and A. Barchiesi, eds., *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Lanham. 65-76.

GENERAL INDEX

Αἶνος: 35-6, 36n.3, 37n.9
Alcaeus as invective: 8, 8n.29, 10, 10n.35
Anacreon
  Adespota: 142n.30
  Invective poet: 10
  Themes in iambic poetry: 143-4, 148-50; Eros: 27n.107
Anacreontea as imitation: 6
Ananius: 143, 147, 148
Archilochus
  Aesimides: 120, 121n.45
  Animal fable: 35-6, 64-5, 158-9n.77
  Charilaus: 17, 24
  Charon: 6, 6n.20, 8, 48, 57, 76
  Colonizer: 9n.32
  Distant land/setting: 62-3, 73, 115
  Dithyramb: 14-5, 14n.51
  Epic poetry: 13-4, 14n.49, 59n.88
  Epic (influences from): 20, 21, 21n.80, 22
  First person
    Trimeters: 6n.18, 76-8, 81-2, 98, 124-5
    Elegy: 117, 118-9
  Food/eating
    Trimeters: 39, 66, 112
    Elegy: 101, 112
  Glaucus: 23, 23n.93, 24, 82, 83, 103n.11, 120, 121n.45
  Homosexuality: 53-4, 54n.65
  Initiation scene: 12-3, 12-3ns.42-5
  Invective: 10, 24, 24n.95, 43, 43n.28, 44, 67-8, 73
  Low social class: 57-8, 70-1
  Lycambes: 16, 16ns.58-9, 18, 18n.69, 43, 46n.37, 77, 77-8n.6, 78, 85
    Typological: 16, 16n.58
    Historical: 16ns.58-9, 18, 18n.69
  Lycambidae: 43, 43-4n.29, 52n.57, 85, 85n.21
  Melesander: 44, 54, 85
  Mesopotamian influences: 52n.53
  Military references
    Trimeters: 38, 38n.13, 39, 39n.15, 65, 113-4
    Elegy: 105, 113-4
  Mythological themes: 13-4, 59-60, 71-2, 114-5
  Nouns
    Trimeters: 95-7, 98
    Elegy: 130
  Paean: 14-5
  Pericles: 24, 24n.95, 103, 120, 121
  Person of the verb
    Trimeters: 89-92, 94
    Elegy: 126-8
  Prayer: 62, 72-3, 115, 148
  Second person
    Trimeters: 82-3, 84, 125-6
    Elegy: 120, 121-2
  Serious reflection
    Trimeters: 48-9, 68, 113
    Elegy: 103, 113
  Sexual/erotic references
    Trimeters: 52-4, 69-70
    Elegy: 108
  Sophos: 9
  Third person
    Trimeters: 85-6, 89, 126
    Elegy: 122, 124
  Verbs (diction)
    Trimeters: 94-5
    Elegy: 128-9
  Wine Drinking
    Trimeters: 42, 66, 112-3
    Elegy: 102, 112-3
Aristotle
  Dithyramb: 152-3
  Dramatic performance of iambus: 16, 16-7n.61, 17, 17n.62
  Iambic meters: 5-6n.16, 156, 156n.68, 156n.70
  ἰαμβίζειν: 7
  Invective: 10
  Psogos: 6, 7, 8
  Public performances of iambus: 13, 13n.46, 18
  Satyric choruses: 152, 154, 154n.63
  Tragedy and comedy: 151

Aulos: 24, 24n.97, 76n.1

Callinus
    First person: 117
    Military references: 105, 113-4
    Nouns: 130
    Person of the verb: 126-8
    Prayer: 111, 115
    Second person: 120, 121n.44
    Third person: 122-3, 124
    Verbs (diction): 128-9
    Wine drinking: 102, 112-3
Cercidas: 147n.45
Chronology
    Iambic poets: 29-30
    Elegiac poets: 100, 100n.1
Classification (Alexandrian) of genres
    Criteria: 11, 11n.38, 28, 28n.111
        Content: 28, 28ns.112-3
        Performance setting: 29
    Callimachus: 11
    Proclus: 11
Colonization poetry, performance: 107n.19
Crates: 147n.45

Demodocus of Leros: 143
Diphilus: 147

Elegy, deriving from *threnos*: 9
Epodes: 9, 36n.5, 65
Euclides of Athens: 145, 147
Euenus: 146

Heraclitus on Homer and Archilochus: 13
Hermippus of Athens: 145, 148, 155n.65
Herodotus on trimeters: 5, 5-6n.16, 6
Hesiod: 13, 13n.44, 20, 20-1n.78-80
Hipponax
    Arete: 48n.41, 50n.48, 55, 59, 80, 88
    Aristocratic status: 80n.11
    Athenis: 84, 84n.19, 88
    Bupalus: 22, 27n.107, 46, 47n.38, 48n.41, 50n.48, 55-6, 67, 80, 88
    Cicon: 47, 58, 61n.93, 88
    Epic (influences from): 22
    Eunuch: 47, 47n.40, 56
    First person: 79-82, 98, 124-5
    Food/eating: 41, 66, 112, 147
    Homosexuality: 47, 56, 67, 92
    Initiation scene: 12-3, 13n.45
    Invective: 46-8, 67-8, 73-4
    Low social class: 58-9, 70-1
    Mimnes: 47, 58, 90
    Mythological: 60-1, 72, 114-5
    Nouns: 95-7, 98
    Odyssey: 56, 60-1, 61n.94
    Person of the verb: 89-92, 94
    Pharmakos: 46, 46n.37, 47
    Prayer: 62, 72-3, 115
    Psogos (generalized): 50n.48
    Second person: 84, 125-6
    Serious reflection: 50, 68
    Sexual references: 55-6, 69-70
    Third person: 88-9, 126
    Topography: 63, 73, 115
    Verbs (diction): 94-5
    Wine drinking: 42-3, 66
Homer and iambic poets: 21, 21n.80, 22, 38, 39, 39n.15; tragedy: 153
Hymn to Demeter: 4-5, 26

Iambe: 4, 5, 5n.13, 26; iambus' derivation from Iambe: 5n.13; no connection with ritual: 17-8n.68
Iambus
    Ancient etymologies: 1n.1
    Comedy (connection to): 151, 151n.51, 152, 152n.53
    Context of performance
        Archilochus: 23-4, 27n.107
        Choruses: 16, 17, 18-9
        Cult: 12-7; ritual abuse: 5, 17n.65, 17-8n.68
        Dialogues: 16, 17, 17n.62, 19, 80n.12
        Festivals: 15, 15n.54, 23n.92,
        Hetaireia: 17, 26, 152
        Hipponax: 26, 27n.107
        Monodic performance: 19, 19ns.76-77,
        Semonides: 24-5
        Solon: 25-6
        Symposium: 3, 3n.8, 19n.77, 20, 22-8, 45n.33, 54n.67, 78n.7, 152, 159
    τερπωλαί: 2, 3, 3n.8, 4n.11, 16-7n.61
    θαλίαι: 2

Epic (influences from): 20-2
Magic: 15n.54
Near-Eastern connections, 16-7n.61
General poetry: 3, 4, 4n.12
Inscriptions (metrical)
Epitaphs
Attica: 135-6
Outside of Attica: 136-7
Dedications
Attica: 137-8
Outside of Attica: 138-9
Summary of iambus: 139-40
Summary of elegiacs: 140

Margites: 7, 22
Mimnermus
City affairs: 107
Colonization: 107, 107n.19
First person: 117-8, 119
Military references: 106, 114, 114n.29
Mythological: 110, 115
Nouns: 130
Person of the verb: 126-8
Second person: 120, 122
Serious reflection: 103-4, 149
Sexual/erotic references: 109
Third person: 123, 124
Verbs (diction): 129
Mnesiepes inscription: 13n.43, 14, 14n.51, 18

Panarces: 146
Plato on iambus: 6-7, 7n.22
Psogos: 10; not a necessary element of iambus: 28n.110

Sappho: 6n.17; as invective: 8, 8n.29
Scatology: 71n.110, 145, 148
Scythinus: 146
Semonides
Animal fable: 37-8, 40n.17, 64-5
Colonizer: 9n.32
Elegiac poet: 116n.30
Epic: 20, 20n.78, 20-1n.79, 21, 45, 158-9
First person: 78-9, 81-2, 98, 124
Food/eating: 40, 66, 112, 148
Invective: 44-5, 67-8, 148
Low social class: 58, 70-1
Military references: 39, 65
Mythological: 60, 72
Nouns: 95-7, 99
Person of the verb: 92-4; selective sampling: 93
Second person: 83-4, 125-6
Serious reflection: 49-50, 68, 113
Sexual references: 54-5, 69-70
Third person: 86-7, 89, 126
Verbs (diction): 94-5
Wine drinking: 42, 66, 112-3
σκώπτειν, *σκώμματα*: 5, 7, 8n.26, 26-7, 144
Slaves: 69-70, 89
Social mobility: 71n.109
Solon
Distant setting: 111-2, 115
Erotic references: 109
First person
Trimeters: 79, 81-2, 98, 124-5
Elegy: 118, 119
Food/eating: 40-1, 66, 112
Invective: 45-6, 73
Military references: 39, 65, 114
Nouns
Trimeters: 95-6
Elegy: 130
Oikismos: 63n.103
Person of the verb
Trimeters: 92-4
Elegy: 126-8
Prayer: 111, 115
Second person
Trimeters: 84, 125-6
Elegy: 120, 121-2
Seisachtheia: 8, 40n.21, 45
Serious reflection
Trimeters: 50, 68, 113
Elegy: 104, 107, 113, 149
Third person
Trimeters: 87-8, 89, 126
Elegy: 123-4
Tragedy: 153
Trimeters and tetrameters classified as iambic by later authors: 8, 8n.27
Verbs (diction)
Trimeters: 94-5
Elegy: 128-9
Wine drinking
Trimeters: 42, 66, 112-3
Elegy: 102, 112-3

Susarion of Megara: 144, 147-8

Tetrameters: 5, 5-6n.16, 8n.27, 9, 23ns.92-3, 61n.96, 83n.18, 156, 156ns.68-70, 156-7n.71
Thales: 27
Theognis
- City affairs: 107-8
- Erotic references: 109-10
- First person: 118, 119
- Food/eating: 101-2
- Military references: 106, 114
- Mythological: 110-1, 115
- Nouns: 130
- Person of the verb: 126-8
- Prayer: 111, 115
- Second person: 120-1, 121n.46
- Serious reflection: 104, 149
- Third person: 123-4
- Verbs (diction): 128-9
- Wine drinking: 101-2, 112

Thespis: 152, 153
Thucydides: interchangeability of person of the verb: 121n.44
Timocreon of Rhodes: 145-6, 147
Tragedy
- Content: 158-9
- Context of performance: 159
- Dialect: 155
- Meter: 156-7
- Origins: 14, 154
- Person of the verb: 160n.79
- Tetrameters: 155, 156, 156ns.68-70, 156-7n.71, 157
- Verse structure: 155-6

Tyranny: 6n.18
Tyrtaeus
- City affairs: 107
- Erotic references: 108-9
- First person: 117, 118
- Military references: 106, 114
- Nouns: 130
- Person of the verb: 126-8
- Second person: 120, 121n.44
- Third person: 123-4
- Verbs (diction): 128-9

Tzetzes on Archilochus: 3-4, 4n.12, 79n.9

Xenophanes: 113n.28, 114n.29

SUPPLEMENTS TO MNEMOSYNE

EDITED BY H. PINKSTER, H.S. VERSNEL,
I.J.F. DE JONG AND P. H. SCHRIJVERS

Recent volumes in the series

175. ROSSUM-STEENBEEK, M. VAN. *Greek Readers' Digests?* Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10953 6
176. McMAHON, J.M. *Paralysin Cave.* Impotence, Perception, and Text in the *Satyrica* of Petronius. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10825 4
177. ISAAC, B. *The Near East under Roman Rule.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10736 3
178. KEEN, A.G. *Dynastic Lycia.* A Political History of the Lycians and Their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10956 0
179. GEORGIADOU, A. & D.H.J. LARMOUR. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel* True Histories. Interpretation and Commentary. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10667 7
180. GÜNTHER, H.-C. *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit.* 1998. ISBN 90 04 11008 9
181. HUNT, T.J. *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10970 6
182. HAMEL, D. *Athenian Generals.* Military Authority in the Classical Period. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10900 5
183. WHITBY, M. (ed.). *The Propaganda of Power.* The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10571 9
184. SCHRIER, O.J. *The* Poetics *of Aristotle and the* Tractatus Coislinianus. A Bibliography from about 900 till 1996. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11132 8
185. SICKING, C.M.J. *Distant Companions.* Selected Papers. 1998. ISBN 90 04 11054 2
186. SCHRIJVERS, P.H. *Lucrèce et les Sciences de la Vie.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10230 2
187. BILLERBECK M. (Hrsg.). *Seneca.* Hercules Furens. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11245 6
188. MACKAY, E.A. (ed.). *Signs of Orality.* The Oral Tradition and Its Influence in the Greek and Roman World. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11273 1
189. ALBRECHT, M. VON. *Roman Epic.* An Interpretative Introduction. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11292 8
190. HOUT, M.P.J. VAN DEN. *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 10957 9
191. KRAUS, C. SHUTTLEWORTH. (ed.). *The Limits of Historiography.* Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10670 7
192. LOMAS, K. & T. CORNELL. *Cities and Urbanisation in Ancient Italy.* ISBN 90 04 10808 4 *In preparation*
193. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *History of Greek Colonization and Settlement Overseas.* 2 vols. ISBN 90 04 09843 7 *In preparation*
194. WOOD, S.E. *Imperial Women.* A Study in Public Images, 40 B.C. - A.D. 68. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11281 2
195. OPHUIJSEN, J.M. VAN & P. STORK. *Linguistics into Interpretation.* Speeches of War in Herodotus VII 5 & 8-18. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11455 6
196. TSETSKHLADZE, G.R. (ed.). *Ancient Greeks West and East.* 1999. ISBN 90 04 11190 5

197. PFEIJFFER, I.L. *Three Aeginetan Odes of Pindar*. A Commentary on *Nemean* V, *Nemean* III, & *Pythian* VIII. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11381 9
198. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid 7. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10842 4
199. IRBY-MASSIE, G.L. *Military Religion in Roman Britain*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10848 3
200. GRAINGER, J.D. *The League of the Aitolians*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 10911 0
201. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable*. I: Introduction and from the Origins to the Hellenistic Age. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11454 8
202. GRAINGER, J.D. *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11350 9
203. SOLOMON, J. *Ptolemy* Harmonics. Translation and Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 115919
204. WIJSMAN, H.J.W. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book VI*. A Commentary. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11718 0
205. MADER, G. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography*. Apologetic and Impression Management in the *Bellum Judaicum*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11446 7
206. NAUTA, R.R. *Poetry for Patrons*. Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian. 2000. ISBN 90 04 10885 8
207. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Roman Fable*. II: The Fable during the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages. Translated by L.A. Ray. Revised and Updated by the Author and Gert-Jan van Dijk. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11583 8
208. JAMES, A. & K. LEE. *A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna,* Posthomerica V. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11594 3
209. DERDERIAN, K. *Leaving Words to Remember*. Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11750 4
210. SHORROCK, R. *The Challenge of Epic*. Allusive Engagement in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11795 4
211. SCHEIDEL, W. (ed.). *Debating Roman Demography*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11525 0
212. KEULEN, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca* Troades. Introduction, Text and Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12004 1
213. MORTON, J. *The Role of the Physical Environment in Ancient Greek Seafaring*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11717 2
214. GRAHAM, A.J. *Collected Papers on Greek Colonization*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11634 6
215. GROSSARDT, P. *Die Erzählung von Meleagros*. Zur literarischen Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11952 3
216. ZAFIROPOULOS, C.A. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: The* Augustana *Collection*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11867 5
217. RENGAKOS, A. & T.D. PAPANGHELIS (eds.). *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11752 0
218. WATSON, J. *Speaking Volumes*. Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12049 1
219. MACLEOD, L. *Dolos and Dike in Sophokles'* Elektra. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11898 5
220. MCKINLEY, K.L. *Reading the Ovidian Heroine*. "Metamorphoses" Commentaries 1100-1618. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11796 2
221. REESON, J. *Ovid* Heroides *11, 13 and 14*. A Commentary. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12140 4
222. FRIED, M.N. & S. UNGURU. *Apollonius of Perga's* Conica: Text, Context, Subtext. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11977 9
223. LIVINGSTONE, N. *A Commentary on Isocrates'* Busiris. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12143 9
224. LEVENE, D.S. & D.P. NELIS (eds.). *Clio and the Poets*. Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11782 2
225. WOOTEN, C.W. *The Orator in Action and Theory in Greece and Rome*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12213 3

226. GALÁN VIOQUE, G. *Martial, Book VII. A Commentary*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12338 5
227. LEFÈVRE, E. *Die Unfähigkeit, sich zu erkennen: Sophokles' Tragödien*. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12322 9
228. SCHEIDEL, W. *Death on the Nile*. Disease and the Demography of Roman Egypt. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12323 7
229. SPANOUDAKIS, K. *Philitas of Cos*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12428 4
230. WORTHINGTON, I. & J.M. FOLEY (eds.). *Epea and Grammata*. Oral and written Communication in Ancient Greece. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12455 1
231. McKECHNIE, P. (ed.). *Thinking Like a Lawyer*. Essays on Legal History and General History for John Crook on his Eightieth Birthday. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12474 8
232. GIBSON, R.K. & C. SHUTTLEWORTH KRAUS (eds.). *The Classical Commentary*. Histories, Practices, Theory. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12153 6
233. JONGMAN, W. & M. KLEIJWEGT (eds.). *After the Past*. Essays in Ancient History in Honour of H.W. Pleket. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12816 6
234. GORMAN, V.B. & E.W. ROBINSON (eds.). *Oikistes*. Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12579 5
235. HARDER, A., R. REGTUIT, P. STORK & G. WAKKER (eds.). *Noch einmal zu....* Kleine Schriften von Stefan Radt zu seinem 75. Geburtstag. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12794 1
236. ADRADOS, F.R. *History of the Graeco-Latin Fable*. Volume Three: Inventory and Documentation of the Graeco-Latin Fable. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11891 8
237. SCHADE, G. *Stesichoros*. Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12832 8
238. ROSEN, R.M. & I. SLUITER (eds.) *Andreia*. Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11995 7
239. GRAINGER, J.D. *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12840 9
240. KOVACS, D. *Euripidea Tertia*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12977 4
241. PANAYOTAKIS, S., M. ZIMMERMAN & W. KEULEN (eds.). *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12999 5
242. ZACHARIA, K. C*onverging Truths*. Euripides' *Ion* and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition. 2003. ISBN 90 0413000 4
243. ALMEIDA, J.A. *Justice as an Aspect of the Polis Idea in Solon's Political Poems*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13002 0
244. HORSFALL, N. *Virgil,* Aeneid *11*. A Commentary. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12934 0
245. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Cicero's Style*. A Synopsis. Followed by Selected Analytic Studies. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12961 8
246. LOMAS, K. *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean*. Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13300 3
247. SCHENKEVELD, D.M. *A Rhetorical Grammar*. C. Iullus Romanus, Introduction to the Liber de Adverbio. 2004. ISBN 90 04 133662 2
248. MACKIE, C.J. *Oral Performance and its Context*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13680 0
249. RADICKE, J. *Lucans Poetische Technik*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13745 9
250. DE BLOIS, L., J. BONS, T. KESSELS & D.M. SCHENKEVELD (eds.). *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works*. Volume I: Plutarch's Statesman and his Aftermath: Political, Philosophical, and Literary Aspects. ISBN 90 04 13795 5. Volume II: The Statesman in Plutarch's Greek and Roman *Lives*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13808 0
251. GREEN, S.J. *Ovid,* Fasti *1*. A Commentary. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13985 0
252. VON ALBRECHT, M. *Wort und Wandlung*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13988 5
253. KORTEKAAS, G.A.A. *The Story of Apollonius, King of Tyre*. A Study of Its Greek Origin and an Edition of the Two Oldest Latin Recensions. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13923 0
254. SLUITER, I. & R.M. ROSEN (eds.). *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13925 7
255. STODDARD, K. *The Narrative Voice in the* Theogony *of Hesiod*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14002 6

256. FITCH, J.G. *Annaeana Tragica*. Notes on the Text of Seneca's Tragedies. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14003 4
257. DE JONG, I.J.F., R. NÜNLIST & A. BOWIE (eds.). *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature*. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative, Volume One. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13927 3
258. VAN TRESS, H. *Poetic Memory*. Allusion in the Poetry of Callimachus and the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid. 2004. ISBN 90 04 14157 X
259. RADEMAKER, A. Sophrosyne *and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint*. Polysemy & Persuasive Use of an Ancient Greek Value Term. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14251 7
260. BUIJS, M. *Clause Combining in Ancient Greek Narrative Discourse*. The Distribution of Subclauses and Participial Clauses in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14250 9
261. ENENKEL, K.A.E. & I.L. PFEIJFFER (eds.). *The Manipulative Mode*. Political Propaganda in Antiquity: A Collection of Case Studies. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14291 6
262. KLEYWEGT, A.J. *Valerius Flaccus,* Argonautica, *Book I*. A Commentary. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13924 9
263. MURGATROYD, P. *Mythical and Legendary Narrative in Ovid's* Fasti. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14320 3
264. WALLINGA, H.T. *Xerxes' Greek Adventure*. The Naval Perspective. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14140 5
265. KANTZIOS, I. *The Trajectory of Archaic Greek Trimeters*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14536 2
266. ZELNICK-ABRAMOVITZ, R. *Not Wholly Free*. The Concept of Manumission and the Status of Manumitted Slaves in the Ancient Greek World. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14585 0
267. SLINGS, S.R. (†). Edited by Gerard Boter and Jan van Ophuijsen. *Critical Notes on the Text of the Politeia*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14172 3